DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 424 PS 021 934

AUTHOR	Davies, Don; And Others
TITLE	Fitting Policy to Family Needs: Delivering Comprehensive Services through Collaboration and Family Empowerment. Report No. 21.
INSTITUTION	Boston Univ., Mass. School of Education.; Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	Sep 93
CONTRACT	R117Q00031
NOTE	79p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center on Families, Communities, Schools, and Children's Learning, Johns Hopkins University, 3505 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218 ($8.00).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Agency Cooperation; Community Programs; Cooperative Programs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Family Involvement; *Family Programs; Federal Programs; *Federal State Relationship; Homeless People; Migrant Programs; *Partnerships in Education; Public Policy; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 1; Even Start; *Integrated Services; *Parent Empowerment; Program Characteristics; Project Head Start

ABSTRACT

The mission of the Center of Families, Communities, Schools & Children's Learning is to conduct research, evaluation, and policy analyses aimed at increasing knowledge about how families, schools, and communities influence student motivation, learning, and development, as well as how to strengthen the connections between these three major social institutions. This report examines federal and state efforts to deliver comprehensive family services through interagency cooperation and family empowerment policies. An introductory section defines comprehensiveness, collaboration, and empowerment, provides a typology of family and community involvement activities, and describes the Center's focus on reviewing policies in four promising areas: Service Integration; Easing Transitions from Early Childhood To School; Parent Involvement in Education; and Migrant and Homeless Families. These are the subjects of the four main sections of the report. They examine: (1) service integration initiatives involving families in collaboration and empowerment, using programs in Florida as examples; (2) selected federal and state efforts to support the transition from preschool to kindergarten through collaboration and empowerment, citing initiatives such as Head Start and New Jersey's GoodStarts; (3) empowering families through comprehensive parent involvement policies, including Chapter 1 programs, special education, Head Start, Even Start, and the Kentucky Education Reform Act; and (4) federal and state efforts to provide comprehensive services to migrant and homeless children in Texas, Michigan, Florida, Minnesota, and Illinois. A concluding section presents some lessons learned from past programs and proposes solutions to specific difficulties of comprehensive, collaborative, and empowering initiatives. An appendix provides a list of organizations advocating service integration, school transition programs, comprehensive parent involvement, and migrant and homeless programs. (MDM)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ED 366 424

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

FITTING POLICY TO FAMILY NEEDS

Delivering Comprehensive Services Through Collaboration and Family Empowerment

Don Davies
Patricia Burch
Ameetha Palanki

Report No. 21 / September 1993

PS 021934

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CENTER ON FAMILIES,
COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS
& CHILDREN'S LEARNING

Boston University, School of Education

Institute for Responsive Education

605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309 fax: (617) 353-8444

The Johns Hopkins University

3505 North Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218 (410) 516-0370 fax: (410) 516-6370

with research partners at

Michigan State University, College of Education

501 Erickson Hall, East Lansing, MI 48824 (517) 355-1734 fax: (517) 353-6393

Temple University

13th and Cecil B. Moore Avenues, Philadelphia PA 19122 (215) 204-1559 fax: (215) 204-5539

University of Washington

Seattle WA 98195 (206) 543-9200 fax: (206) 685-3284

Wheelock College

45 Pilgrim Road, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 734-5200 fax: (617) 566-7369

Yale University

310 Prospect Street, New Haven, CT 06520 (203) 432-9931 fax: (203) 432-9933

For more information on the work of the Center, contact:

Owen Heleen, Dissemination Director,

Institute for Responsive Education,

605 Commonwealth Avenue, Boston, MA 02215 (617) 353-3309 fax: (617) 353-8444

National Advisory Panel

Robert Bartman (Chair), Commissioner of Education, Missouri Department of Education, Jefferson City MO

Barbara Bowman, Erikson Institute, Chicago IL

James Comer, Maurice Falk Professor of Child Psychiatry, Yale Child Study Center, New Haven CT

Gayle Dorman, Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, Winston Salem NC

Sanford M. Dornbusch, Director, Family Study Center, Stanford University, Stanford CA

Susan Freedman, Director, Office of Community Education, Massachusetts Department of Education, Quincy MA

Frieda Garcia, Executive Director, United South End Settlements, Boston MA

Maria Garza-Lubeck, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington DC

Patricia M. Lines, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ex-officio)

Evelyn K. Moore, Executive Director, National Black Child Development Institute, Washington DC

Douglas R. Powell, Child Development and Family Studies, Purdue University, West Lafayette IN

Jonathan Sher, Director, North Carolina REAL Enterprises, Chapel Hill NC

Nora Toney, Teacher, David A. Ellis School, Roxbury MA

Rafael Valdivieso, Vice President, Academy for Educational Development, Washington DC

Robert Witherspoon, Education Consultant, RaSaun & Associates, Inc., Herndon VA

FITTING POLICY TO FAMILY NEEDS

Delivering Comprehensive Services through Collaboration And Family Empowerment

Don Davies
Patricia Burch
Ameetha Palanki

Report No. 21

September 1993

Published by the Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning. This work has been supported by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education (R117Q 00031) in cooperation with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The opinions expressed are the authors' own and do not represent OERI or HHS positions or policies.

CENTER ON FAMILIES, COMMUNITIES, SCHOOLS & CHILDREN'S LEARNING

The nation's schools must do more to improve the education of all children, but schools cannot do this alone. More will be accomplished if families and communities work with children, with each other, and with schools to promote successful students.

The mission of this Center is to conduct research, evaluations, policy analyses, and dissemination to produce new and useful knowledge about how families, schools, and communities influence student motivation, learning, and development. A second important goal is to improve the connections between and among these major social institutions.

Two research programs guide the Center's work: the Program on the Early Years of Childhood, covering children aged 0-10 through the elementary grades; and the Program on the Years of Early and Late Adolescence, covering youngsters aged 11-19 through the middle and high school grades.

Research on family, school, and community connections must be conducted to understand more about all children and all families, not just those who are economically and educationally advantaged or already connected to school and community resources. The Center's projects pay particular attention to the diversity of family cultures and backgrounds and to the diversity in family, school, and community practices that support families in helping children succeed across the years of childhood and adolescence. Projects also examine policies at the federal, state, and local levels that produce effective partnerships.

A third program of Institutional Activities includes a wide range of dissemination projects to extend the Center's national leadership. The Center's work will yield new information, practices, and policies to promote partnerships among families, communities, and schools to benefit children's learning.

Table of Contents

Foreword v
Bernice Weissbourd

Preface viii
Don Davies

Introduction 1

Service Integration Initiatives:
Involving Families in Collaboration and Empowerment 10
Ameetha Palanki

Selected Federal and State Efforts to Support
The Transition From Preschool to Kindergarten through
Collaboration and Empowerment 21
Patricia Burch

Empowering Families Through
Comprehensive Parent Involvement Policies 31
Ameetha Palanki

Federal and State Efforts to Provide
Comprehensive Services to Migrant and Homeless Children 40
Patricia Burch

Conclusion 50
Don Davies

Appendix:
Organizational Contact List 59

List of Tables

Table 1. Levels of Collaboration and State Approaches to Foster Collaboration 3

Table 2. Typology of Family and Community Involvement Activities 6

Table 3. Selected Federal and State Transition Initiatives 30

Table 4. State Compliance with Chapter 1 Parent Involvement Requirements 32

Foreword

Across America, regardless of racial, ethnic or economic status, families are finding it increasingly difficult to give their children what they know is necessary for healthy development. One has only to speak to parents to learn that, even in the most devastating environment, parents persist in having dreams for their children to be better educated than they are, and to have a life that surpasses their own. It is a sad fact that our policies and institutions often place barriers in their way, and often blame rather than help beleaguered parents.

Stressed as perhaps never before, there are more families in the United States living in poverty, high divorce rates, and greater numbers of families in which both parents must work in order to maintain an adequate standard of living. The phrase "family break-down" has become commonplace in describing the state of our nation's families.

To alleviate such stress, families not only require -- but deserve -- social service and educational systems that support their efforts, and strengthen their capacity to provide a good environment for their children. That is not to say that systems should supplant families in the lives of children. They obviously should not. The premise that families have, and must take, primary responsibility for their children is deeply embedded in American culture. What is missing is its corollary, as expressed in the bipartisan National Commission on Children report, *Beyond Rhetoric: A New American Agenda for Children and Families* (1991):

> Community institutions -- schools, religious organizations, service and charitable organizations, and employers -- have an important role in creating an environment that is supportive of parents and children.

Today, our social and educational systems fall short of meeting the demands of family life. Typically, our social service system is overburdened with caseloads so high that workers are able to respond only to the most desperate. Yet, even in cases in which need is great and resources are available, families are shortchanged. The system functions in a fragmented, impersonal, bureaucratic manner: mothers with infants and toddlers wait six hours in a clinic before they see a doctor; families are shunted to as many as 18 different agencies to address the needs of their family members; children who are diagnosed as being developmentally delayed wait a year and a half before beginning a plan of therapeutic intervention. In most communities,

schools close at 3:00 p.m. and "latch-key" children often roam the streets while their parents at work feel helpless and anxious.

The fact that families are in crisis, and that existing systems have proven non-responsive, has led to a re-thinking on the part of professionals as well as parents. Furthermore, a reconsideration of how to meet the needs of families has been fueled by mounting evidence on the importance of the early years of a child's life. There is a growing conviction that providing services that promote family health from the conception of a child is not only cost-effective (eliminating the need for expensive interventions) but a far more human approach to children.

What families need -- and are entitled to -- begins with the availability of affordable, high quality medical care from the prenatal period forward. After the birth of a child, parents should have the reassurance that they will be visited by a home visitor who can answer their questions, offer information, and encourage the confidence they need to do their job well. Family resource and support programs should be available in their communities, places where they are able to meet other parents, form supportive relationships, get assistance as needed and participate in programs that they themselves have a hand in designing.

Families who have children with physical, mental health, or developmental problems should have available to them, early on, appropriate treatment in the least restrictive setting possible. And highly-stressed families deserve the reassurances that, whatever the complexities of their situation, they will receive services without unnecessary red tape and "run-around," but rather with respect and consideration.

At every level in this comprehensive pyramid of services, families should get the message that their culture and traditions are valued, and that their personal strengths are the building blocks for growth and change. Information and support in this system should be given to parents in ways that illuminate alternatives, widen choices, and encourage exploring options, as opposed to accepting dictated "answers" to their "problems."

Parents in this construct would be seen as partners in a process. The importance, challenges, and satisfactions in their roles would be understood, and any approach that implied, except in cases of repeated abuse and neglect, a belief that children should be "rescued" from their families would be considered unacceptable.

To assure such a "family-friendly" service and education system, collaboration at all levels becomes a necessity. Discrete problems in families cannot be separated from how the families function, and how the family functions is, in fact, the mutual concern of the varied agencies and institutions serving it. The promise of healthier families in a community depends in large measure on the willingness of service providers, educators, and policy makers to collaborate with each other and with parents toward achieving a shared vision. Collaboration is a vital tool for giving families the skills to be successful, for proclaiming that the community values its families and will work together with them to reach the ultimate goal -- children who have had the opportunity and encouragement to grow up to be productive, cooperative, caring citizens.

BERNICE WEISSBOURD
President
Family Focus, Inc.
Chicago, Illinois

Preface

Since the mid-1980's there has been a flood of policy activity about family-school-community relationships in the United States.

The strongest and most numerous waves are at the state level, where there is a multitude of new legislated mandates, regulations, and programs. We reported on many of these developments in *Mapping the Policy Landscape: What Federal and State Governments are Doing to Promote Family-School-Community Partnerships* (Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning, 1991).

There are also significant new Federal streams as well, and many eddies of local initiatives not directly tied to Federal and state policies, and a great many ripples created by the private sector through foundations, advocacy groups, research centers, and special commissions.

To continue the metaphor, the tide is running very unevenly from community to community, state to state, and across Federal agencies. The nature of these developments and their real and potential impact is hardly begun to be felt by most front-line practitioners and administrators. And, there is little more than anecdotal evidence as yet about what the effects have been on the ultimate beneficiaries, the children and their families.

We have committed ourselves over the five years of the life of the Center (1990-1995) to study these developments and make recommendations to as many audiences as possible.

In this work we must be selective, because the area is broad and vaguely defined and consists of so many separate topics and specializations, including early childhood education, family support, parent choice, school restructuring, parent and family involvement, and health, welfare, and social service policies.

We will comment on a limited number of these developments, but first -- before we set the metaphor aside entirely -- it is important to think a bit about why the surge of policy activity has occurred.

The large gap between growing needs and society's response to these needs stands out as a good starting point. The great and growing social, educational, and

economic needs concentrated in the cities but also in rural poverty areas and small towns as well became more obvious by the early 1980s and were chronicled in numerous recent reports and books. The needs grew just as local, state, and Federal programs were being cut back or expanding slower than the demands for service. This was the era in which government was being defined as part of the problem, not as part of the solution. Taxpayer revolts were widespread. Service providers were constrained by lack of money and also by the hard task of changing policies and traditional practices quickly to meet new conditions.

The growing needs and the slowness of government institutions and schools and other service providers to change their traditional ways produced high levels of concern on the part of business leaders and economists about the connections between these conditions and the nation's declining productivity and competitiveness with the developed countries of Asia and Europe.

Political pressure from business and corporate leaders increased. Corporate leaders became active in educational reform efforts. For example, reports of the Committee on Economic Development, an organization of major corporate executives, received wide attention in the late 80s (Committee for Economic Development, 1987).

Concerns also grew about the threat posed by the gap between need and institutional response to the nation's aspirations for social justice and equal opportunity for all people. Major advocacy groups increased their visible efforts and captured the attention of some policymakers.

Research and policy work also began to have some impact in the family-community-school policy-making arena. Some examples: 1) the High Scope studies showed the lasting positive effects of good early childhood programs that combined education, health, and family interventions (Ramey and Campbell, 1987; Weikart, 1989); 2) James Comer's (1980) success in increasing achievement in some New Haven schools called attention to the importance of the whole child, linking emotional, physical, social, and intellectual development; 3) a growing body of research showed a positive relationship between student achievement and parent engagement in children's learning (Epstein, 1982; Henderson, 1987); and 4) many studies confirmed the connection between good health care and nutrition from prenatal period through infant and toddler stages on later physical, social, and academic success (Zigler and Freedman, 1987).

The decision of the U.S. Department of Education and its Office of Educational Research and Improvement in 1990 to fund the first national research and development center devoted exclusively to work in this area is also a significant branch of the policy tide we are discussing here. That the Department of Health and Human Services joined the Department of Education in the initial funding of this center is without many precedents in the Federal research and development world.

Many policymakers became interested in greater government and agency efficiency as one answer to the need-response gap and paid attention to proposals for "reinventing government" (Osborne & Gaebler, 1992) -- looking toward interagency coordination, privatizing some services, decentralizing and reducing the size and control of central bureaucracies. A search for efficiency as an antidote to limited resources and taxpayer revolts led some state policymakers to consider various approaches to coordination among education and other state agencies. There was also a revival of interest in the service integration idea which had received a great deal of attention in the 1960's (e.g., the Federally-funded Model Cities program).

As the broader school restructuring and reform movement gathered steam in the late 1980s in some states and cities, some efforts were made to incorporate parents and community representatives into restructured mechanisms for school planning and governance. The traditional advisory committee was often employed, despite the accumulated evidence about the token nature of most such devices. Parent participation in decision-making and governance was given slight attention in developing policies except in the important cases of the parent-dominated local school councils in Chicago and the Kentucky Education Reform Act.

These are some of the factors have contributed to the surge of policy action which seeks to meet the multiple needs of children and families.

A central policy question is: how is the society responding to these needs? But, from the point of view of families, the central questions are: how do we obtain the kind of educational, social, and health services which will allow our children to develop in healthy and productive ways and to succeed in school and in life? What are our responsibilities? Who else is responsible and how can we connect with them?

Our starting point in answering these questions for families is drawn from the mission of the Center on Families. We see families, educational institutions, and the community's social, cultural, and health institutions as having a shared and

overlapping responsibility for the development and the social and academic success of all children.

The nature and quality of the connections among these multiple institutions in every child's world is of major importance to their successful development. The title of this report, "Fitting Policy to Family Needs," highlights the importance of such connections.

Introduction

Children and their families do not experience their lives in neatly compartmentalized or fragmented ways and yet it is in precisely this fragmented manner that services are delivered. The policies that support educational and human services at all levels reinforce the fragmentation of delivery and reduce the chances that children and their families who need help will get that help.

The concept of "comprehensiveness," is one way that policymakers or service providers can try to address the problem of fragmentation. This concept as applied to educational and social programs is the focus of this report.

Comprehensiveness

We use the terms "comprehensiveness," "comprehensive," and "comprehensive program" to mean "the pulling together of programs on the basis of the needs of children and families... recognizing the interconnections between problems and developing varied strategies in order to resolve them (Palanki and Burch, 1992)."

By our definition, programs are comprehensive when they:

- attend to children's multiple and interrelated needs, which includes their physical, emotional, social, academic, and moral development;
- recognize children and families needs as overlapping;
- are inclusive, not inflexibly bound by categories of participant characteristics;
- recognize and incorporate the multiple ways that families can be involved with schools and other human service agencies;
- provide for continuity across age levels;
- allow for intensity of service which can be geared to level and nature of need; and
- are accessible to those who need the services, including those who are most distressed.

Our work over the last two years allows us to assert that policies which foster programs with these characteristics will be more likely to fit the needs of children and families even though we recognize that much more research and evaluation is needed to understand how these general characteristics work in practice and with what outcomes.

Collaboration

Our two-year review also makes clear that while there are many strategies being used to move in the direction of comprehensiveness, the strategy of collaboration is critical if any significant degree of comprehensiveness is to be achieved in practice.

Our emphasis on collaboration reflects our belief that collaboration between families, communities and schools can support the delivery of comprehensive services and encourage the academic and successful development of all children.

For "collaboration" we borrow Charles Bruner's definition: "....a process to reach goals that cannot be achieved by acting singly" (Bruner, 1991). With Bruner we see collaboration as a means to an end, not an end in itself. The end for this project is the responsiveness of comprehensive services and policies to family needs. "Coordination" is another term commonly used to refer to policies which allow or require joint information exchange, planning, funding, administration, service provision, or evaluation between and among separate units, departments, agencies, institutions, or individuals.

The distinction between collaboration and coordination is part of a larger academic debate which we will not attempt to resolve in this report. For the most part, collaboration is the substance of *partnerships between people* and agencies while coordination refers to formal agreements between agencies. Some researchers and social scientists have created a hierarchy of activity with coordination preceding collaboration. Our research indicates, however, that collaboration and coordination are part of a two-way exchange in which collaboration could precede or follow coordination. (For the purposes of this report, those initiatives which integrate services using both coordinating and collaborative strategies are referred to as service integration initiatives).

Multi-level Collaboration

Based on our two years of work, we join with Bruner in identifying the need for multi-level collaboration which extends beyond the local level and to the Federal and state institutions which support or hinder efforts within communities.

Bruner has developed a useful framework (See Table 1) which has informed the organization of data in this report. Based on the idea that "collaboration should be fostered at every level of organization," Bruner identifies four levels of collaboration:

Table 1

LEVELS OF COLLABORATION

Level 1: Interagency Collaboration -- Administration
Administrators at the state or local level manage agencies to facilitate interagency and intra-agency collaboration through protocols, interagency agreements, staff organization, staff incentives, and job evaluation systems.

Level 2: Interagency Collaboration -- Service
Workers at the service-delivery level in various agencies are given incentives and support for joint efforts with staff in other agencies.

Level 3: Intra-Agency Collaboration
Workers at the front-line, service-delivery level are given discretion in serving clients, provided support for decision-making, and involved in agency planning.

Level 4: Worker-Family Collaboration
Front-line worker and family members determine needs, set goals, and work toward greater family autonomy and functioning.

STATE APPROACHES TO FOSTER COLLABORATION

First-Generation Approaches
Through the establishment of interagency groups (task forces, commissions, committees, or councils), state policymakers direct agencies to plan together to address child and family needs.

Second-Generation Approaches
States finance and provide guidance and technical assistance to local collaborative initiatives through multi-site demonstration projects. Sites are selected for their ability to develop models to meet child and family needs that could apply to other parts of the state.

Third-Generation Approaches
Building on the experiences of multi-site demonstration projects, state policymakers design comprehensive, statewide collaborative approaches to meet child and family needs, incorporating strategies to develop the leadership base needed to support successful programs.

Source: Bruner, C. (1991). *Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services* Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

- Inter-agency Collaboration -- Administrative;
- Inter-agency Collaboration -- Service;
- Intra-agency Collaboration; and
- Worker-Family Collaboration.

Inter-agency collaboration is primarily administrative at local and state levels and is what some analysts would call "coordination." The outcome of collaboration at this level would include protocols and inter-agency agreements.

The second level focuses on joint efforts of service providers from different agencies working together, not simply formal interagency arrangements. An example of this level of collaboration may lead to a partnership between a teacher and a social worker to support a child's need for a quiet and safe place to study after school.

In intra-agency collaboration, front-line workers in a single agency are given discretion in providing services. Examples: a school principal uses funds from an education program to offer workshops on child nutrition to teen-age parents; teachers and family support workers sit on a program policy board.

In Bruner's fourth level the concept of collaboration is extended to families -- the end-users or beneficiaries of programs and services. Here, front-line workers -- teachers, social workers, public health nurses, youth center counselors -- work with family members to determine family needs, meet goals, and work toward greater family autonomy and self-direction.

Collaboration as Empowerment

Bruner's framework introduces empowerment as a critical strategy embedded within effective collaboration. Front-line staff are empowered through access to information, choices about uses of program strategies and funds, and influence in planning and decisions to determine how services are delivered within their own agency or across agencies serving the same population of children. Family empowerment is implicit in Bruner's worker and family collaboration. Families who are able to work in partnership with front-line workers are empowered to determine their own needs and redefine the worker-client relationship, moving from the hierarchical to the collaborative.

Collaboration and Empowerment as Interlocking Strategies

Bruner's model reflects our own belief that empowerment is a critical strategy embedded within effective collaboration and a means to comprehensive services. By our definition, collaboration and family empowerment are inter-locking strategies. Collaborative strategies should provide central roles for the end-users or beneficiaries

of the results of that collaboration, such as a plan for service integration in a school or community agency. In turn, empowerment strategies will help families become more effective as collaborators, with more to bring to the partnerships that are forged.

By family empowerment we mean increasing the capacity of families and their children to get and use information, to take action on their own interests and problems, to meet their obligations to their own children and their communities, to contribute to and influence policies and decisions which affect them, and to function independently and effectively as community residents, workers, and citizens in a democratic society.

What is not explicit in Bruner's framework, but is of central concern to this study, is the centrality of family empowerment across levels of collaboration. Families need to be involved as key partners not only at the level of individualized service delivery but also within inter-agency and cross agency planning. The critical role which Bruner affords to front-line workers in collaborative efforts, we extend to families. With front-like workers, families should be policy shapers who "provide a valuable perspective on the systemic changes needed to serve [them]" (Bruner, 1991).

Multiple Ways that Families are Involved

Our identification of families as integral partners in collaborative efforts points us to the work of Epstein (1990). Through many years of research, Epstein has developed a typology of family and community activities which recognizes the shared responsibilities of families, communities and schools in making collaboration work for children. This typology, which has been adapted by the Center on Families, is shown in Table 2.

The typology is especially relevant to work in this report in that it recognizes the family as critical link rather than object of partnership. In addition, the typology helps illustrate the concept of comprehensiveness in relationship to schools' involvement of families. Rather than seeing partnership as unidimensional, Epstein's typology reflects the fact that family involvement strategies take varied forms and have different goals. Some occur in different locations in the home and school, and each includes scores of different practices.

We use the framework as a reference point to examine the extent to which Federal and state policies encourage a comprehensive approach to empowering families at the building level.

Table 2.

TYPOLOGY OF FAMILY AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

Type 1: Basic Obligations of Families. Families are responsible for providing for children's health and safety, developing parenting skills and child-rearing approaches that prepare children for school and that maintain healthy child development across grades, and building positive home conditions that support learning and behavior all across the school years. Schools help families to develop the knowledge and skills they need to understand their children at each grade level through workshops at the school or in other locations and in other forms of parent education, training, and information giving.

Type 2: Basic Obligations of Schools. The schools are responsible for communicating with families about school programs and children's progress. Communications include the notices, phone calls, visits, report cards, and conferences with parents that most schools provide. Other innovative communications include information to help families to choose or change schools and to help families help students select curricula, courses, special programs and activities, and other opportunities at each grade level. Schools vary the forms and frequency of communications and greatly affect whether the information sent home can be understood by all families. Schools strengthen partnerships by encouraging two-way communications.

Type 3: Involvement at School. Parents and other volunteers who assist teachers, administrators, and children in classrooms or in other areas of the school are involved, as are families who come to school to support student performances, sports, or other events. Schools improve and vary schedules so that more families are able to participate as volunteers and as audiences. Schools recruit and train volunteers so that they are helpful to teachers, students, and school improvement efforts at school and in other locations.

Type 4: Involvement in Learning Activities at Home. Teachers request and guide parents to monitor and assist their own children at home. Teachers assist parents in how to interact with their children on learning activities at home that are coordinated with the children's classwork or that advance or enrich learning. Schools enable families to understand how to help their children at home by providing information on academic and other skills required of students to pass each grade, with directions on how to monitor, discuss and help with homework and practice and reinforce needed skills.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Type 5: Involvement in Decision-making, Governance, and Advocacy. Parents and others in the community serve in participatory roles in the PTA/PTO, advisory councils, Chapter 1 programs, school site management teams, or other committees or school groups. Parents also may become activists in independent advocacy groups in the community. Schools assist parents to be leaders and representatives by training them in decision-making skills and in how to communicate with all of the parents they represent; by including parents as true, not token, contributors to school decisions, and by providing information to community advocacy groups so that they may knowledgeably address issues of school improvement.

Type 6: Collaboration with Community Organizations. Schools collaborate with agencies, businesses, cultural organizations, and other groups to share responsibility for children's education and future success. Collaboration includes school programs that provide or coordinate children and families' access to community and support services, such as before- and after-school care, health services, cultural events, and other programs. Schools vary in how much they know about and draw on community resources to enhance and enrich the curriculum and other student experiences. Schools assist families with information on community resources that can help strengthen home conditions and assist children's learning and development.

Source: Epstein, J.L. (1992). School and family partnerships. In M. Alkin (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Educational Research. Sixth Edition (pp. 1140-1151). New York: MacMillan.

Policy and Program Examples

We review selected policies in four areas in order to see how the policies appear to move toward the objective of comprehensiveness using strategies of collaboration. We locate evidence about if and how policymakers are addressing the fitting of policies to the multiple, overlapping needs of families.

But a major emphasis in our work has been to move beyond describing flaws and barriers to comprehensiveness to locating positive examples of collaboration, including at the family empowerment level.

The four topics we discuss in this report were selected because they have been subject to considerable policy action. The topics and the principal policy questions we are asking under each are:

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1) Service Integration. How are Federal, state, and local governments seeking to encourage the integration or coordination of education and other services across agencies? How, if at all, are these approaches including families in decision-making about service integration activities?

2) Easing Transitions From Early Childhood to School. What kinds of Federal, state, and local models are being developed to coordinate services across agencies to ease the transition of children and their families from early childhood to school? How are families involved in decision-making about these transition programs?

3) Parent Involvement in Education. What Federal, state, and local models are being developed to involve parents in education? How are states complying with Federal mandates for parent involvement in educational programs (e.g., Chapter 1 and special education)?

4) Migrant and Homeless Families. What state or Federal policies are seeking to coordinate services for meeting the special needs of migrant and homeless children and their families? How are these policies seeking to involve family members in decision-making about these programs?

Methodology and Data Sources

Three methodologies are employed in this project:

1) Ongoing survey of policy developments and trends. Project researchers continuously monitor events and trends in relevant areas. We scan and read educational periodicals including *Education Week, Education Daily,* and the *Chronicle of Higher Education* as well as magazines such as *Phi Delta Kappan, Education Digest, Harvard Education Letter,* and numerous organization, foundation, agency, and research center newsletters, announcements, and reports.

2) Telephone interviews. Building on the results of our earlier report (Palanki et al. 1992) we identified promising initiatives related to the four topics listed above and to the strategies of collaboration and empowerment and interview personnel in state agencies and local programs.

3) Discussions with other researchers and analysts. Project researchers regularly discuss the meaning of information collected on policies and informally seek the reactions of other researchers in the Center and other organizations and centers, including members of the Center's International Network of Scholars.

Components of this Report

The next four sections look at (1) service integration, (2) easing transitions from early childhood to school, (3) parent involvement policies, and (4) migrant and homeless families and children. Each section examines selected Federal and state policies to create local collaborative and empowering programs, and provides brief case studies of programs which seem to have promise to increase comprehensiveness through strategies of collaboration and family empowerment.

In the last section we offer some broad conclusions, discuss several points derived from our review of good examples which have implications for policy and practice at all levels, and sketch briefly the plans for the next steps in this project.

Service Integration Initiatives: Involving Families In Decision-Making

While much of the debate on coordinating services concentrates on the logistics of actual collaboration, there is growing attention being paid to the involvement of "consumers" or families and other residents in decision-making around the design, implementation, and evaluation of service integration initiatives. The first half of this chapter looks at various service integration initiatives at the state, local, and building levels and at what extent these initiatives support family involvement in decision-making. The second half of this chapter identifies a state model -- Florida's School-Based Integrated Services Program -- which shows promise for involving families in decision-making at many different levels.

Service Integration at the State Level

The role of state administrators and policymakers in service integration initiatives varies from the formulation of formal agreements between agencies to technical assistance to and governance of local programs. The following section identifies the different roles states have undertaken to integrate services.

Formal Agreements

One of the initial steps undertaken by states to integrate services is to create a formal, written policy or interagency agreement between state departments of social services, education, and in some cases, public health and labor. These agreements outline a state's objectives and goals for achieving integration of services as well as creating committees with policymaking responsibilities. The interagency agreement is a first step to identifying the need for collaboration among agencies. In and of itself, it has very little impact programmatically on families and communities, but the agreement represents an initial policy step toward organizational restructuring (see the Florida case study below).

Funding

In addition to developing interagency agreements, many state-level agencies and policymakers have focused on funding. Taking their cue from Head Start, states have shied away from providing rigid models of service integration and have instead concentrated their efforts on identifying key components of successful integration initiatives and crafting RFPs to support these efforts. By tying funding to particular aspects of program development, states can mandate family involvement while giving local practitioners the flexibility to build in family involvement in a variety of ways appropriate to their individual circumstances.

For example, the Healthy Start program in California requires that local service integration initiatives seeking funding under Healthy Start must provide a proposal with mechanisms for family involvement in decision-making without limiting proposals to particular formulas for parent representation. The lack of guidelines for family involvement, however, may result in myriad plans for involving families and communities, some of which are effective and others which are not. It is unclear what criteria are used to differentiate proposals for family involvement in decision-making. There is potential, however, to create guidelines for comprehensive involvement of families in decision-making. The California State Board of Education has developed a parent involvement policy for schools and districts, and the State Legislature has passed a parent involvement bill consistent with the 1988 Chapter 1 amendments to involve families and communities in decision-making. What is needed is coordination between parent involvement policies already in place in the education field and the Healthy Start requirements.

Planning Committees

In addition to issuing RFPs, some states have planning committees primarily made up of human resource and education department heads. These planning committees attempt to bridge the gap between policy and program by disseminating information to local agencies and school districts concerning service integration and providing technical assistance when possible. It is in the context of these planning meetings that decisions about what goes into an RFP or state plan for service integration are sometimes made. For example, in the state of Ohio, a state planning committee -- the Interdepartmental Cluster for Services -- has been established through statute to facilitate joint planning of community-based service integration. The Department of Human Resources has assigned an on-site facilitator to assess the needs of communities, provide an inventory of resources available in the community, and participate in community-based planning. Seven communities have been chosen, and services are being provided from a variety of access points including schools, family resource centers, and public housing projects.

Technical Assistance

In New Jersey, the School Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP) has established 29 school-based youth service centers across the state which provide job training, counseling, and health services for at-risk adolescents. SBYSP administrators at the state level provide developmental technical assistance to sites. By concentrating their efforts on technical assistance, program administrators shift from a monitoring position to a collaborative role. This enables more communication about problems and concerns to occur between local program directors and state administrators. The site directors inform state administrators when they require assistance and state administrators make visits to sites. One of the more important

services they perform for local directors is to bring together the various partners in the service integration effort with the lead agency to work through difficulties they are encountering. Because the lead agency is not necessarily the location of service integration, this assistance is important for facilitating communication between partners.

Coordinating Councils

Some states also have coordinating councils whose primary responsibility is to facilitate the development of policies to support local integration efforts. These coordinating councils have the capacity to reshape regulations around programmatic requirements (such as eligibility requirements, and funding sources) in order to support integration efforts. The state of Georgia, for example, has a Policy Team for Families and Children responsible for developing strategic policies to facilitate planning for community-based service integration efforts. Under the direction of the Council of Governor's Policy Advisors, the Georgia Policy Team for Families and Children consists of 20 members from state agencies, the state legislature, and private foundations. The Team's main tasks are to define the problems of at-risk families and children, develop strategic policy solutions accordingly, and monitor the implementation of these policies at the local level.

Most state-level planning committees and coordinating councils do not include families or communities in decision-making. The logic behind lack of family involvement at the state level appears to have to do with the limited responsibilities of the committees and the difficulty in logistics for family participation. The experience of Chapter 1 and Even Start state review panels, however, suggests that family involvement at the state level is feasible. While participating through review panels is only one strategy among many to involve families and communities, it is a step toward more comprehensive participation and responsive programming.

Service Integration at the Local Level

At the local level, family involvement in service integration initiatives increases but the strategies for involvement are still limited and traditional. Mechanisms for decision-making at this level are often narrowed to coordinating councils or coalitions consisting of the various partners involved in the collaborative arrangement.

Coordinating Councils and Coalitions

Coordinating councils or coalitions are responsible for planning, designing, implementing, and evaluating their service integration efforts. More often than not, coordinating councils do not include the families and communities served by these programs. Rather, they are usually comprised of school personnel, representatives of

community organizations, management representatives of service agencies, community advisory members, and other organizations and officials (such as unions, day care organizations, and city officials). One exception is the New Beginnings program in San Diego. New Beginnings is governed by a coordinating committee consisting of representatives from participating agencies, community-based organizations, the school principal from the participating school (Hamilton Elementary School), a community advisory group, and the coordinator for the program. Parent and community input is solicited through the community advisory group, which participates in decisions about program design and implementation. Plans are currently underway to expand school-linked services to all elementary schools in San Diego.

Coordinating councils are often accompanied by smaller executive committees or governing boards consisting of "higher ups" including school superintendents, city managers, and directors of social service agencies. These boards are responsible for making decisions about program direction and development while the councils implement these decisions. The New Beginnings program provides an example of an executive committee which oversees the coordinating committee. The executive committee includes the deputy city manager, the county chief administrative officer, the directors of social services and of the health department, the chief probation officer, and the housing commissioner. Families and community representatives, however, do not serve on these committees because these committees are considered primarily administrative and, therefore, inappropriate for family involvement.

Advisory Boards

In addition to coordinating councils and their accompanying executive committees, another mechanism for decision-making is an advisory board. These advisory boards often have families, school staff, community leaders, service agency representatives, and school principals serving on them. While these boards do not have direct governance responsibilities, their effectiveness depends on the extent to which they are taken seriously and in some cases, how vigorously they seek to empower parents and communities. In some cases, they have direct input (short of voting power) into program design and evaluation. For example, the Denver Family Opportunity (DFO) Program has a client advisory board which plays an integral part in not only the design of the program but also in the accountability structure. The client advisory board advises the larger DFO council and executive committee which consists of representatives from service providers, advocacy and consumer groups, government offices and agencies, and the business/private sector. This committee is responsible for making decisions about the program and is the key accountability structure for the program. Former chairs of the committee have included members from the client advisory board, service providers, and advocates.

In another example, the school board of Holyoke, Massachusetts convened an advisory group consisting of families, teachers, and medical personnel (school-based and private) to develop a comprehensive health care program in the schools. The school board passed a resolution which made health education a graduation requirement for students and developed a K-12 health education curriculum. All these efforts were collaboratively developed and implemented with input from the advisory board to insure the program would be a successful venture with as little resistance as possible. Holyoke is one of a handful of communities that we have discovered with a comprehensive service program initiated by the school board. As the school board is responsible for formulating school policy, it represents a potentially valuable partner for easing collaboration between schools, families, service agencies, and communities. However, because of political and fiscal reasons, school boards are often underutilized or ineffective sources for facilitating collaborative ventures.

Service Integration at the Building Level

Service integration efforts at the building level appear to have the potential for involving families and communities in decision-making in a variety of ways. School-based service integration initiatives are often governed by a council or committee housed in the school building. These committees are comprised of the principal, teachers, counselors, social workers, and other "non-educational" staff who are involved in the delivery of services to students. These councils have the potential to include families who receive these services, but many do not. One example of a service integration initiative that does include families is the Denver Family Resource Schools. While the overall program is overseen by a steering committee, decisions at the building level are governed by councils or committees which include school staff (non-educational and educational), the principal, parents, and community members. Six Family Resource Schools have used their site-based management councils to coordinate activities and develop an action plan for the service integration initiative in each of their schools.

In New Jersey, the School-Based Youth Services Program (SBYSP) has a community advisory group which is responsible for choosing the lead agency (e.g., a school, district, community organization, or social service agency) to coordinate services in a particular community. The community advisory group is representative of families and communities to be served by the SBYSP site. Once chosen, the lead agency is eligible to apply for SBYSP funding. In order to be eligible for funding, the lead agency must conduct a community needs assessment and determine staffing allocation and resources and other outside private sources to be used in coordinating services in their community. After the proposal is drafted, it is sent to the County Human Services Advisory Board, which also includes family and community representatives in that particular county. This advisory board chooses one or two sites and submits them to the State Department of Human Services for funding approval.

Although these initiatives exemplify some ways in which families and communities can be involved in service integration decision-making, comprehensive involvement is still lacking. Service integration initiatives have not yet utilized their full potential for involving families and communities in meaningful ways.

Service integration initiatives tend to focus on the issue of collaboration more often than the empowerment of end-users in program decision-making. Involvement of end-users is primarily relegated to participation on advisory boards or coordinating councils. This strategy limits the number of parents who can participate and raises issues about the kinds of families who are represented on these boards and the families being served by the program. Further research is needed to clarify the roles families themselves can play and the effectiveness of programs based on their increased involvement in all aspects of program design and implementation.

School-Based Integrated Services in Dade and Broward Counties, Florida: A Descriptive Study of Comprehensive Family Empowerment in a Service Integration Initiative

In the fall of 1991, Florida International University's Department of Social Work and the Institute on Children and Families At Risk won a competitive grant from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to develop a community-based service integration program effort -- the School-Based Integrated Services (SBIS) program. The program is being implemented in two south Florida counties: Dade and Broward, and is illustrative of a consumer-driven model of service delivery. Through the establishment of family resource centers in schools, the program purports to develop "a multicultural, multi-generational, multi-model, and multi-systems approach to service integration." In addition to integrating a variety of services to meet the multiple and interrelated demands of today's families and communities, the program seeks to develop a service delivery system which builds family empowerment and capacity for economic self-sufficiency. The emphasis is not only to assist families and communities but also to place families and communities in the center of decision-making or "ownership" in this program.

The program provides an interesting case of service integration not only because it involves families and communities at various levels of administration and integration, but also because it involves families in a variety of ways. This study describes the program according to the Center's parent involvement typology at the family, building, county, and state levels.

School-Based Integrated Services at the Family Level

One of the main emphases of this program is the empowerment of families. By seeking to tailor their efforts to the needs of families, program staff expect families

to work *with* the school and agencies to help develop a plan to help their children succeed academically, socially, and physically. Thus, families are conceived of as partners, not merely recipients of services.

Type 1. Basic obligations of families. Families are given a choice about the kinds of services they wish to receive. They also choose what kinds of personal information can be shared between agencies and with whom that information can be shared. In this program, the families are the architects or brokers of their own support web by choosing those services and agencies they believe are necessary for their particular circumstances.

Type 2. Basic obligations of schools. Information about services and the provision of services are located in school-based family resource centers which create programs with multicultural and multi-generational aspects as well as involving different services (from health to education) and different levels of agencies (from the county to the family). Families are responsible for setting the agenda of these centers and for working with social workers to identify needs and strengths and to find resources to address these needs.

School-Based Integrated Services at the Building Level

Type 1: Basic obligations of families. At the building level, schools have established family resource centers that provide a variety of services including information about services available to families, domestic violence support groups, mediation and legal assistance to solve housing and business disputes, advice for aging adults, and counseling about welfare services, public health, and family/individual concerns.

The family resource centers are staffed with interagency teams consisting of school social workers, interns, and parent facilitators. The parent facilitators have undertaken specific roles as paraprofessionals and advocates in the interest of empowering families and developing responsive programs. The parent facilitators call themselves RAINMAKERS and are parents recruited from a group of parents organized in each school. The parent group at the Feinberg-Fisher School has been responsible for proposing the institution of a Head Start program at South Beach. After being trained as paraprofessional social workers, some RAINMAKERS have returned to school for ESL classes and other improvements to better their economic position. The school has even hired some of these RAINMAKERS. RAINMAKERS have also organized a homework club to assist families who do not have the space or furniture to help their children with homework at home.

Type 5. Involvement in decision-making, governance, and advocacy. The parent group is a recruiting ground for identifying parent facilitators who will

participate in the family resource center interagency teams. The parent group is responsible for drafting job descriptions and identifying those characteristics that are desirable for parent facilitators. By participating in this activity, the parent group assists social workers with issues of cultural diversity and needs unique to particular communities.

The responsibilities of the parent group are three-fold: (1) they are responsible for conducting a needs and strengths assessment of their communities; (2) they have drafted a consumer bill of rights which constitutes the policy foundation for family empowerment and capacity-building; and (3) they will develop long-range goals for the family resource centers. Through training in assertiveness, problem-solving skills, and conflict resolution skills, the parent group builds capacity and empowers them to identify and resolve problems within their communities.

Articulating long-range goals for the family resource center provides an opportunity for family and community involvement in expanding service provision to the community as a whole. This enables families and communities to fashion a community resource center consistent with the unique needs and strengths of the community and to reflect the cultural diversity of their communities.

School-Based Integrated Services at the County Level

At the county level, there is a steering committee for coordinated service delivery which includes parents, service providers, Florida International University project facilitators, and school personnel. The steering committee facilitates coordination by developing a shared mission and making decisions about loaning staff from different agencies to meet the perceived needs of a particular community. Coordination is further enhanced by the committee's commitment to child welfare from a family focus point of view. The steering committee has adopted a consumer driven model which assumes that family empowerment and capacity-building is central to their efforts.

Type 5: Involvement in decision-making, governance, and advocacy. In addition to the steering committee, families and communities are invited to participate through a consumer bill of rights. This bill of rights guarantees family and community representation on governing boards of all agencies who provide services to their communities. This policy is a powerful tool which sends a message to families, communities, and service providers alike that their input is not only valued but an integral part of service integration design and implementation.

The accountability structure for this program follows a developmental or action research strategy whereby every practice is the consequence of reflection and research. A data base is compiled from families, communities, and interagency teams from

which multiple problem-solving strategies are generated. This action research model has potential for inviting participation of families and communities in assessment and decision-making around future directions of the family resource centers.

Type 6: Collaboration and exchange with community organizations. Finally, Dade County Health and Rehabilitative Services has organized a task force for developing organizing principles for community service to families and children. The task force created a working draft of a coordinated community plan for services to families and children residing in Dade County. The organizing principles recognize the family as the primary provider for children's welfare and accord families the authority to make decisions about their children's welfare. Also, children are recognized as participants in decisions that affect their lives. Given this emphasis, responsibility for defining support systems lies with the local communities in partnership with families and schools to take advantage of formal and informal support networks. Programs are locally controlled in order to respond quickly and effectively to the particular needs of individual families and communities. Because families are conceived as the primary guardians of their children's well-being, service providers should assist families who are in need rather than supplant them. Conversely, in families where children's safety are at risk or families are unable to provide for severely disabled children, legal action can be taken by public agencies to insure protection of these children. These principles were assembled from research on family support by national and state commissions. This working draft represents an initial policy foundation at the county level for supporting family-focused, community-controlled service integration plans.

School-Based Integrated Services at the State Level

As early as 1988, Florida took policy initiative at the state level to foster service integration between social services and the schools. In 1988, the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of the Department of Human and Rehabilitative Services (HRS) signed an interagency cooperative agreement which created three administrative structures to coordinate activities. This agreement was meant to start the process for creating a comprehensive system of care for children and subsequently their families. The three administrative structures included an executive level committee with the Commissioner and the Secretary, a policy development workgroup, and a policy implementation workgroup.

Type 5: Involvement in decision-making, governance, and advocacy. The executive committee was responsible for setting interagency program priorities, informing the state legislature about these priorities, and resolving issues of implementation that could not be resolved at either of the other two levels. The executive committee is supposed to meet before the budget is submitted to the

legislature in order to identify priority initiatives for the following year. The executive committee also meets quarterly to evaluate implementation of the established priorities.

Type 6: Collaboration and exchange with community organizations. The policy development workgroup consists of representatives from the Departments of Education and HRS. The Education members are representatives from the Division of Public Schools and Vocational, Adult, and Community Education. The HRS members are in charge of operations and programs. In addition to these members, the Education and HRS policy coordinators from the Governor's office also serve on this workgroup. This group recommends priority initiatives to the executive committee. Once established, the policy development workgroup develops policies and procedures to facilitate implementation of these priorities. The workgroup resolves any issues not taken care of at the policy implementation level. They meet quarterly to evaluate the progress of policy implementation.

The policy implementation workgroup is comprised of state level program administrators who are responsible for implementing the activities set forth by the established priorities. They develop the strategies to implement joint activities between the two agencies. They report to the policy development group about implementation of the priority initiatives and identify for them those issues that have not been resolved. They meet twice a month to organize work plans, develop policies, and draft timelines for implementation.

In addition to this cooperative agreement, the governor's office has been active in forging coordination between agencies. At the same time as it established the Dade County HRS task force, the governor's office also established an interim task force on social services, which issued a report in the spring of 1991. Among the recommendations were a set of principles which emphasized the importance of individual empowerment to gain self-sufficiency. Providing services to individuals can only be effective if they build upon family strengths and needs -- once again, a family-focused system. Delivery of services depends upon partnerships between local communities and state agencies. Communities should be involved in decision-making around the choice of HRS district administrators. Local councils with elected members could be established to give voice to families and communities receiving services in ascertaining community needs and strengths and in developing action plans. At the state level, it is recommended that a statewide Human Services Council be created to seek out Federal grant opportunities, keep track of new ideas, and disseminate these ideas to local communities. Here, the task force recommends that advocacy groups play a large role in voicing needs to the state level. Out of these mechanisms, policies around billing, service provision, administration, and accountability can be formulated and reformulated to serve the needs of families and communities more effectively.

While the state has recognized the need for integration of services, much of the activity has centered around administrative planning. To capitalize on the state's attention to service integration, many organizations have been trying to work with state agencies to create a system-wide service integration initiative. For example, the Florida Family Resource Coalition (FFRC) has been instrumental in forging a statewide campaign for family-focused support systems.

Katharine Briar, project director for the program, has worked with the FFRC to advise state policymakers on integrating the many social service pilot programs already in place. Briar has a proposal for a statewide strategy which would accompany state efforts to reorganize service delivery. Among the recommendations are a Family Support Agenda with services that are family-focused and family-friendly, comprehensive approaches with new practices for integrating services, services which develop family self-sufficiency with transfer of skills and resources, special attention to policy impact on cultural and familial diversity, and the creation of support networks which build upon "natural" (or informal) resources such as extended families, neighbors, and other groups. To make funding easier for integrated services, categorical funding should be more flexible to avoid forcing programs to adapt to rigid structures or services. Funding for community-based initiatives is also necessary.

At this time, the Florida Family Resource Coalition reports that no state action has been taken. The FFRC is in the process of putting this issue on the agenda of state legislators before the session concludes.

Selected Federal and State Efforts to Support the Transition From Preschool and Child Care Programs to Kindergarten

In 1989, President Bush and the governors of all 50 states made a commitment that by the year 2000, all children will start school ready to learn. This section examines selected Federal and state efforts to support transition activities to help children start and stay ready to learn. By transition activities, we mean efforts to provide children with continuous educational, health and social supports as they move from preschool and child care programs into kindergarten. This discussion will pay particular attention to the role of interagency collaboration and family empowerment. Our working principle is that local collaboration between community agencies, public schools, and families is supported by collaboration between corresponding agencies at the Federal, state and local level.

In the United States, early childhood and elementary school education has developed on largely separate tracks. As a result, many of the over four million children who make the transition to public schools annually experience disruptions in education and care which can have marked effects on their later academic success (Administration for Children, Youth and Families, 1991). Children and families entering kindergarten frequently confront a learning environment which lacks many of the services that may have supported their educational development under Head Start. A recent Department of Education (1992) study revealed that discontinuity of learning environment is experienced most intensely by low-income children. The national survey of over 850 school districts identified children in high poverty schools as most apt to experience difficulty in adjusting to academic curriculum.

While family empowerment has been identified as an important influence on children's success in making the transition from preschool to school, it has surfaced as a missing link in current transition activities serving high percentages of low-income children (Department of Education, 1992). Families of low-income children were more likely to be offered fewer opportunities for classroom volunteering, at-home learning, and parent education workshops. Opportunities for parent participation in school policymaking and program planning proved to be even more rare. Only about one-third of surveyed schools claim to have parents participating in school policymaking.

Head Start/Public School Early Childhood Transition Demonstration Project

The Head Start Public School Demonstration Project provides Federal funds to support partnerships between Head Start programs and public schools. The project is testing the hypothesis that continuous comprehensive services help children sustain the

academic gains attained through Head Start. The project targets low-income children in public elementary schools from kindergarten through the third grade. Project participants and their families must have access to comprehensive support services which include "health, immunization, mental health, nutrition, parenting education, literacy, and social services" (H.R. 4151-17 Subtitle B).

In 1992, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families awarded 32 grants of up to $650,000 each, every year for three years. Grantees may be a Head Start or local education agency, or agencies which are receiving funds under the Follow Through Act. Of the 32 initial grantees, nine are public school systems, and 23 are Head Start grantees of which six also are public school systems.

Inter-agency Collaboration

The program creates incentives for inter-agency collaboration at the local level by requiring grantees to form consortia with the local Head Start agency or public school system and with relevant agencies who can assist in provision of comprehensive services. Participating agencies must collaborate in planning, implementation and evaluation of the project. School systems must receive funding under Chapter 1 or Follow Through in order to be eligible for participation.

Family Empowerment

Family empowerment is woven into the program. Families of participating children must be consulted around the development of an individualized transition plan. In addition, each project is required to form a governing board consisting of representatives of the Head Start agency, the local education agency, parents of participating children, and representatives of state and local agencies providing supportive services. At the minimum, 51% of the governing board must be parents of children who will be participating in the demonstration project.

The governing board creates a structure for collaboration between Head Start and public school parents. In the first year of the program, half of the parents must have a child transitioning from a Head Start program. The other subset must be parents transitioning from non-Head Start programs. In the second year, half of the group (now Head Start graduates) must be replaced by a new group of parents of children who are currently making the transition from Head Start and non-Head Start programs. The remaining subset represent parents of kindergarten children.

The Head Start Transition Demonstration Program is one example of how Federal policy can structure incentives for collaboration and family empowerment at the local level. For example, Project REACH, a Newport, Rhode Island collaboration project, has included families on its social service support team. The social services

team is responsible for hooking families up with appropriate health and social services and conducting home visits. "Mentor" families recruited and trained by Head Start will provide support to a small number of participating families who are having difficulty obtaining human services.

The Worcester (MA) Public Schools Transition Program offers workshops on parenting skills, child development, family management, and health education through school-based parent centers. Collaboration between the local Head Start program and public schools has helped parents gain access to "support services" by increasing the number of sites where the workshops are offered.

Inter-Agency Agreement Between ED and HHS

The Head Start Demonstration Project is taking place against a back drop of increased collaboration between the Department of Education (ED) and the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS). An inter-agency agreement between Head Start and the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) was signed in 1990. Under the inter-agency agreement, HHS provided funds under a three-year grant to OERI regional laboratories for transition activities -- $500,000 was provided for the first year and $1 million for each of the two remaining years. A portion of the funding was retained by OERI for a National Policy Forum on Transitions.

All but one of the laboratories hosted a regional transition conference during 1991-92 aimed at encouraging state and local planning. Six regional laboratories received additional funds to identify and provide technical assistance to local demonstration transition projects (Research for Better Schools, Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, South Eastern Regional Vision for Education (SERVE), and Southwest Educational Development Laboratory).

Family Empowerment

Regional laboratories involvement of families in transition initiatives is uneven. The majority of laboratories have identified family involvement as a required component of their demonstration model, but are in the early stages of translating the policy into practice. For instance, one laboratory eliminated family involvement as a criteria for its demonstration model when it could not find any local transition initiatives with family involvement programs already in place. In addition, family involvement on local planning teams is optional. Projects funded by the laboratories establish local planning teams requiring Head Start and public school representation, but very few *require* parent participation.

The Head Start Transition Demonstration Project and Regional Laboratories transition initiatives are examples of how Federal policy can structure incentives for collaboration between community agencies and local schools. The following section looks at a Head Start initiative which departs from the traditional Federal/local funding pattern to provide direct grants to states to expand the scope and reach of comprehensive services.

Head Start State Collaboration Project

The goal of the Head Start State Collaboration Project is to facilitate state-level collaboration between Head Start and state agencies serving low-income children and families and to create a state presence for Head Start. Participating states must undertake cross-cutting initiatives which require coordination between state education, health and social service agencies. Easing transitions from preschool to elementary school is one of six project objectives.

In 1990, the Administration for Children, Youth and Families awarded Head Start Collaboration grants to eleven states for up to $85,000 each for three years. Seven out of the eleven "first wave" states are exploring ways to ease transitions for children (South Carolina, Maine, New Jersey, Virginia, Nebraska, Oregon, Pennsylvania). Ten additional state collaboration grants have been awarded for FY 1993 (Vermont, Maryland, Georgia, North Carolina, Minnesota, New Mexico, Iowa, Colorado, California, Alaska) at $100,000 each for five years.

Inter-agency Collaboration

The state collaboration projects must be managed by a central state office, a state-level commission or a cabinet-level coordinating agency. The New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Oregon collaboration projects are managed by an inter-agency coordinating council formed under the grant.

Through a collaborative agreement with the Region X Head Start Bureau, the Oregon Department of Education is conducting a joint demonstration project which combines a range of Federal child care with state pre-kindergarten funds. Titled the Integrated Child Care program, the program blends Federal Child Care Development Block Grants, State IV-A "at-risk" funds, and JOBS Transitional and State Employment related day care funds. The challenge of the project is "to demonstrate best early education and program administrative practices by implementing continuity of care and consistency of staff throughout the day, consistency of program philosophy, and quality and comparable salary and fringe benefits" (Oregon Department of Education, 1992).

The state-level partnership is mirrored by a collaborative requirement at the local level. Head Start and Oregon pre-kindergarten programs who wish to be pilot "wrap-around" models must form partnerships with a local branch of both the Child Care Resources and Referral, and Adult and Family Service agencies. The intent of the requirement is to increase the comprehensiveness of services to children and families at the program level.

Family Empowerment

Unlike the Head Start Transition Demonstration Grant, the State Collaboration project provides few guidelines for family involvement in state initiatives. The guidelines do not specifically require the participation of parents on management teams. The program does require that key Head Start groups, including the State Head Start association, an umbrella support group which includes the State Head Start Parents Association, be involved in development and implementation of the grant.

Of the seven "first wave" states, only the New Jersey and Pennsylvania collaboration projects mandate the participation of parents on their management committee. As with other kinds of family involvement, parents involved in state-level policymaking need training and support. After acknowledging the lack of participation of parents serving on their own council, New Jersey has designed a two-tiered strategy. As of 1992, each Head Start representative serving on a council or task force has been assigned the responsibility of recruiting parent members. In addition, a full-time parent coordinator has been hired to mentor parents and to coordinate their on-going training as informed advisory council members.

Selected collaboration states are building family involvement into their demonstration projects. Pennsylvania has made family involvement a program requirement throughout its transition demonstration projects. Each project is required to increase family involvement in classrooms and to regularly track the progress of their involvement. Support for involvement is to be provided through family advocacy groups. At least one Pennsylvania project has hired a parent coordinator who will organize a support advocacy group for families of Head Start graduates.

Parents involved in South Carolina's three demonstration projects will receive training in the nationally acclaimed High Scope curriculum. The project also plans to incorporate more non-traditional approaches to encouraging coordination between parents and teachers. As parents learn what's new in preschool educational practice, teachers will be required to attend Head Start parent meetings. Local management of projects has been assigned to local school councils formed under the state's school-based management plan. One member of the transition team must be a Head Start parent.

The Head Start State Collaboration Project creates a structure for increased collaboration between state and Federal agencies and a testing ground for its effect on local programs. However, the project offers few incentives for involving families as equal partners in state-level planning. Agencies participating in the collaboration, (e.g., State Departments of Public Welfare,) may have little tradition of empowering families as part of their program. States, such as Pennsylvania, which empower families as policymakers, can help cross-agency initiatives become more responsive to the needs of families.

New Jersey GoodStarts

The New Jersey GoodStarts program is an example of a state initiative which combines inter-agency collaboration and family empowerment to increase the reach, continuity, and responsiveness of its transition activities.

The program is currently funded at $7 million in New Jersey Department of Education GoodStarts monies and Federal Child Care funds administered by the New Jersey Department of Health and Human Services. The program, developed jointly by the New Jersey Departments of Education and Health and Human Services, is administered under an inter-agency agreement. Grants are available on a competitive basis to "special needs" school districts who have a collaborative agreement with the local Head Start agency. "Specials needs" school districts have been designated as high poverty communities and serve one out of every four children in the state. Six grants were awarded in 1992.

The program has three main aims:

- to expand opportunities for preschoolers ages three to four years to participate in quality preschool programs which incorporate an array of educational, health and social services;
- to foster collaboration among local public school systems and community agencies to effect continuity of services and a smooth transition from preschool into kindergarten-primary school programs; and
- to encourage program improvements in educational programs, pre-kindergarten through second grade. (New Jersey Department of Education, 1992).

The program creates a structure for collaboration between families, communities and schools at the building, program (district), and state level.

Building-Level Collaboration

GoodStarts program policy explicitly encourages partnerships between families and program staff at the building level. Comprehensive parent involvement is a required component of the program, with its own set of performance standards upon which programs are evaluated.

The program's underlying philosophy is that parents and guardians should be recognized as:

- Responsible guardians of their children's well-being;
- Prime educators of their children; and
- Contributors to the program who are essential to the success of the program, both in working with their own children and in cooperating with staff.

Based on this philosophy, the program frames the relationship between parents and program staff as one of partnership and mutual strength. Parent participation in program planning and operation is required. Planning of parent involvement programs encompasses identifying existing community resources and determining how they can be best utilized. In addition, parent participation in classrooms is strongly encouraged, with the goal being to "give the staff the opportunity to know the parents/guardians better and to learn from them." Training and support is available to both staff and parents and under a program jointly developed by staff and parents.

While giving agency staff and parents joint responsibility over program design, GoodStarts explicitly requires local programs to take a comprehensive approach to parent involvement. In addition to more traditional parent involvement activities such as parent-teacher conferences, workshops, and home learning activities, programs are required to provide other kinds of services which will enable parent participation, such as child care and transportation services and family counseling on career and educational planning.

District-level Collaboration

At the district level, participating school districts and the local Head Start agency are required to jointly develop a plan for the successful transition of children and families into public school. The plan must address continuity of educational, health, social service and parent involvement through the second grade. Rather than stop at the level of planning, the program requires that 20% of funds be spent on transition initiatives. The money can go for school-based services -- for example, hiring a social worker to work with children and families in a specific public school -- or for district-wide coordination and planning.

Participating districts must also coordinate with the New Jersey FamilyNet program. The FamilyNet program, a collaborative effort of the Governor's Office and the seven state agencies, operates in special needs school districts. The aim of the program is to provide comprehensive services to elementary school children and their families. Under the direction of regional staff, FamilyNet Community Councils help families access educational, health, and social services. Collaboration between GoodStarts and FamilyNet is intended to create a seamless web of services from pre-kindergarten through 12th grade.

Collaboration at the district level is overseen by an inter-agency policy advisory board. The policy board is defined as the "key to community acceptance and support of the local program, to its response to a demonstrated local need, and to avoidance of service duplication or competition with other worthwhile early childhood programs." The policy board must consist of parents of children in Head Start and in public school, representatives of local agencies providing services, teacher groups and elementary school administrators, state, local and community-based agencies providing support, and one member each of the Board of Education, the Head Start Policy Council, and Welfare agency.

The policy advisory board's program has authority over activities requiring collaboration. Its responsibilities include serving as an intermediary between the Board of Education, Head Start, and the Department of Health and Human Services; planning and implementing activities for parents; administering funds for parent involvement activities, and assessing community needs.

State-Level Collaboration

State-level coordination of the GoodStarts program is paving the way for program continuity at the local level. The program is jointly administered by the state Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education. After negotiations, the decision was made to award funds directly to local school districts with the requirement that they subcontract to Head Start agencies to provide services to pre-kindergartners. This allows grantees to transfer a portion of the program to a recurring funding source. Through incremental steps, services for three-year-olds can be paid for under Head Start expansion monies while services for four-year-olds can be paid for with state aid. The state allows school districts to be reimbursed for services provided to children one year prior to their entry into kindergarten.

Implications for Policy and Practice

This section has examined selected Federal and state efforts to support transition activities for children entering kindergarten. Table 3 shows the main components of each of these efforts.

Interest in creating a bridge between early childhood programs and public schools is not new. For example, in 1974, the Office of Child Development provided funds to 15 demonstration sites to support collaboration between Head Start and public schools (Project Developmental Continuity). There is evidence that current initiatives are being anchored by increased collaboration across Federal, state, and local programs and by efforts to support family empowerment as critical partners in collaboration. There is more work to be done.

Initiatives involving Head Start still reach only a small percentage of children who can benefit from transition services (National Educational Goals Panel, 1991). For example, in urban districts such as Boston, approximately one-third of all eligible families are served by the Head Start program. States are in a good position to craft cross-cutting reforms which can provide comprehensive service to reach more children. However, the majority of state budgets are crippled. In the face of scarce resources, collaboration at any level can sometimes appear as an additional and unaffordable expense.

Federal and state initiatives are moving toward more comprehensive involvement of families in transition activities. As a policymaking partner with a tradition of comprehensive parent involvement, Head Start can serve as an important catalyst for family empowerment at the local level. States such as New Jersey have incorporated key aspects of the Head Start model into their own comprehensive service initiatives. However, as the experience of Chapter 1 suggests, a top-down mandate for parent involvement does not always translate into family empowerment at the local level, especially in settings which have little tradition of parent involvement. Local program managers continue to have important influence over how funds are used. More study is needed on the nuts-and-bolts of how to encourage collaboration between agencies serving children at different age levels while empowering families as the critical link to children's sustained academic success.

Table 3

SELECTED FEDERAL AND STATE TRANSITION INITIATIVES

Initiative	Head Start Transition Demonstration Project	National Regional Laboratories Transition Initiative	Head Start State Collaboration Project	New Jersey GoodStarts
Purpose	Federal funds to support partnerships between Head Start programs and public schools.	Federal funds to OERI regional laboratories for transition activities	Federal funds to facilitate state-level collaboration between Head Start and state agencies	Combination of state and Federal funds to increase and improve comprehensive preschool programs
Eligibility	Head Start agencies and LEA's receiving funds under Chapter 1 and/or Follow-Through	OERI regional laboratories	State governments	Competitive grants to "high poverty"New Jersey school districts
Funding	32 grants awarded in 1992 of up to $650,000 each for each of three years.	$500,000 for first year and $1 million for each of two remaining years	22 states received grants of up to $100,000 each for three-five years.	Project currently funded at $7 million dollars. 6 grants awarded in 1992
Inter-agency Collaboration	Requires collaboration between participating agencies in planning, implementation and evaluation.	Inter-agency agreement between Head Start (HHS) and OERI (DOE)	Project must be managed by state-level commission or agency with a cross-section of agencies represented.	Inter-agency program administration at state, local and program level
Family Empowerment Requirements	Requires comprehensive family service plan 51% of program governing board must be parents of participating children	No specific requirements for family empowerment	Project guidelines do not require parent participation on state-level commission	Requires development of comprehensive family service plan Family participation on state, local and state, district and program advisory committees

Empowering Families Through Comprehensive Parent Involvement Policies

Family involvement in education has been integrated in many a reform plan. From state-level review panels for Chapter 1 and Even Start to elected school boards to school-based decision-making, families and communities have made inroads toward participating in those decisions that will affect the education of their children. Advocates for the inclusion of families and communities in schools assert that family and community involvement will create more responsive and comprehensive services than will traditionally top-down prescribed rigid models for delivering educational and social services.

Part of our study looks at Federal policies with parent involvement components and some state and local responses to these policies. Much of our investigation of parent involvement policies reveals that there are some initiatives to include families through traditional channels and single activities but not much evidence of comprehensive family involvement activities built into reform initiatives. (Traditional channels include parent and community representation on advisory committees at the state and district level. Single activities include open houses, parent-teacher conferences, field trips, and bake sales.)

Chapter 1

A major Federal policy which has led to some development of parent involvement policies is the 1988 amendments to Chapter 1. Based on a brief survey of 37 state Chapter 1 coordinators, we have found that compliance to Chapter 1 parent involvement requirements primarily takes three different forms (see Table 4). The majority of state Chapter 1 offices have redesigned their monitoring instruments to assess the implementation of parent involvement activities in districts during site visits. They also disseminate information to LEAs and parents in conjunction with regional Technical Assistance Centers (TACs). A smaller number of states have created handbooks, training materials, home learning activity materials, and resource guides (with contact names of districts engaging in innovative practices) to assist districts in the creation of parent involvement programs and policies. These states also hold annual statewide parent conferences and provide training on parenting, school involvement, and home learning activities through workshops. Workshops are often run by LEAs and parents. Over half of the states surveyed report aggressive parent involvement policies, pilot projects, and resources (including funding and materials) to assist districts in creating comprehensive parent involvement programs.

Table 4

State Compliance with Chapter 1 Parent Involvement Requirements

States with comprehensive parent involvement policies and programs	59%*
States which offer training to parents through statewide conferences and develop handbooks, and resources	67%
States which monitor district compliance with parent involvement activities through on-site visits	69%

N=37

*Column adds up to more than 100% because many states use more than one strategy to promote parent involvement at the local level.

States report that nearly all districts have developed some kind of parent involvement policy or program consistent with Federal guidelines, with quality and comprehensiveness varying from district to district. District design and development of parent involvement programs are mainly monitored through state applications for Chapter 1 funds. (For a fuller discussion of district Chapter 1 parent involvement initiatives, see Milsap, et al., 1992).

Examples of more developed parent involvement policies at the state level are in California, Maryland, Washington, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, and Oregon. In California, state and district policies have been enacted to inform parents about school activities and programs, to train parents on how they can educate their children through learning activities at home, to include parents in the evaluation of the Chapter 1 program, and to train teachers and administrators to work effectively with parents. The state legislature also mandated parent involvement activities consistent with Federal guidelines through legislation (AB 322). Other states have also created state level policies and/or materials to provide guidelines for involving parents consistent with Chapter 1 parent involvement requirements.

In Maryland, the state department of education has expanded parent involvement policies to mandate that non-Chapter 1 schools develop parent involvement activities. In a recent reorganization effort, state consultants have coordinated parent involvement activities using funds from Chapter 1, Even Start, and state compensatory education funds. The state has hired a Chapter 1 parent coordinator to coordinate parent involvement statewide, while every county is required to have a parent coordinator or liaison under Chapter 1. The parent coordinator is responsible for disseminating information about Chapter 1 to all Chapter 1 parents and assisting schools to comply with Chapter 1 parent involvement regulations. The state has implemented regional training conferences for parents, held in community colleges, to encourage parents to pursue GED classes or postsecondary education. This program, entitled "Chapter 1 Goes to College," increased the number of parents participating in these conferences by locating them closer to the districts.

In Oregon, a parent mentor program has been implemented which employs parents, teachers, and a district superintendent who train districts and parents about parent involvement, multicultural issues, home learning activities, staff development, and other issues. To date, 26 parent mentors have been enlisted in this program, with plans to employ more.

In Wisconsin, Washington, and Rhode Island, an annual parent involvement conference is convened by the state to inform parents about parent involvement and to train them in home learning activities and other activities. Wisconsin's Parent Involvement Leadership Conference provides training to parents on various parent involvement models and activities. Participants, in turn, return to their districts and train parents and schools in these activities. Wisconsin is also using Chapter 1 funds to create a statewide network for Family Math, an interactive math curriculum for elementary school children and families developed in 1981 at the University of California at Berkeley. Materials are being developed to be distributed to districts. Washington Chapter 1 consultants have initiated an "Outstanding Parent Involvement Program" award for schools with innovative programs. They are honored at the parent conference. The state has also produced parent involvement videos on three award winners. Rhode Island Chapter 1 parents led workshops on training and home learning activities during their regional Chapter 1/Title I parent involvement conference.

One other example is the creation of a pilot program on parent involvement in the state of Pennsylvania. The state awarded a consortium of LEAs $500 mini-grants to facilitate teachers and parents working together (the idea of mini-grants was modelled after a similar activity in the state of Florida). They also created a statewide parent advisory council consisting of 15 parents. Parents were selected on the basis of having a child currently enrolled in school, their ability to meet monthly, and their ability to travel to meetings. All parents were sent a parent training application and the

members were chosen from applications received. This council develops materials on training and has regional reviewers who train LEAs about parent involvement.

It has become clear that states can take a leadership role in creating statewide parent involvement initiatives by providing technical assistance, developing policies which encourage family-school partnerships, and providing incentives for parent involvement activities through mini-grants and awards. However, although some states have taken initiative to involve Chapter 1 parents, translating policies at the state level to action and programs at the local level is difficult. Further study is needed to determine the obstacles to implementing parent involvement policies at the local level.

Special Education

For disabled infants and toddlers, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (or IDEA) legislates the use of funds to develop Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSPs) which target services to disabled youngsters *and their families*. This family-centered approach requires families and multidisciplinary professionals jointly to develop an integrated service plan based on needs identified by the family. The IDEA legislation explicitly calls for enabling and empowering of the families to be served: "*Enabling* families means creating opportunities and means for families to apply their present abilities and competencies to meet their needs and the needs of their children . . .[Empowering families] means interacting with families in such a way that they maintain or acquire a sense of control over their family life and attribute positive changes that result from early intervention to their own strengths, abilities, and actions" (Association for the Care of Children's Health, 1991).

The IFSP must include a statement of the child's present development including physical, cognitive, language/speech, and psycho-social; a statement of family needs and strengths provided by the family; a statement of expected outcomes for the child and family; a statement of services to be delivered including frequency, intensity, and methods; a timeline for initiation and duration of services; the name of the case manager assigned to coordinate with other agencies; and a statement of support for transition to preschool services (Association for the Care of Children's Health, 1991).

Head Start and Even Start

In addition to Special Education and Chapter 1, Head Start and Even Start programs require involvement of parents in decisions about their child's educational development. Furthermore, parents have access to information and classes on parenting and adult education. (For fuller discussion of Head Start parent involvement requirements, see pages 21–26 of this report). Even Start requires families to participate in classes together with their children. Federal policy encourages the

integration of Even Start programs with Chapter 1 and Adult Education, but our brief survey of states indicates that most of the states have not taken advantage of this policy. Only two states reported the integration of Chapter 1 with Even Start.

Our survey indicates many initiatives on the part of states to comply with parent involvement requirements in Federal policies; however, in most places, further action toward coordination between parent involvement activities across programs and agencies is needed. Also, more research is needed to determine what kinds of structures, processes, programs, and practices are more effective in involving and empowering families.

School Reform

At the state level, the recent trend in school restructuring has incorporated parent involvement through advisory committees, school-site management councils, and the exercise of school choice. Of the fifty states, 60% have either implemented or are in process of legislating some kind of school restructuring policies with parent involvement components (National Governors' Association, 1989). Eighty percent have implemented or are in the process of legislating school choice plans (Center for Choice in Education, 1991).

We examined the extent to which states implemented comprehensive strategies for encouraging the involvement of parents at the local level. While a majority of states have taken initiative in involving parents in their children's education, there are still very few examples of comprehensive policies and strategies across the six types of parent involvement activities. One exception is the California State Board of Education parent involvement policy (PL 100-297), which incorporated five types of involvement. PL 100-297 mandated districts to adopt similar policies and establish relationships with nonprofit organizations or agencies to design and implement a parent involvement program with the five types as guidelines or goals of the program. A recent state restructuring effort that seeks to encourage comprehensive partnerships is the Kentucky Education Reform Act.

The Kentucky Education Reform Act: A State Strategy to Build Comprehensive Involvement of Families and Communities

The Kentucky Education Reform Act provides an interesting example of one state trying to create a comprehensive education reform package for all students. Although parent involvement is not the key concept behind the reform, parents and communities are invited to participate in school reform at many different levels. The Kentucky Education Reform Act was the Kentucky General Assembly's response to the State Supreme Court declaring the entire educational system unconstitutional. The key components of the Act are as follows: (1) the restructuring of the state Department

of Education; (2) the creation of state performance goals and alternative assessment measures (including portfolios) for all students; (3) the creation of school-based decision-making councils to develop the means for meeting state performance goals; and (4) a system of rewards and sanctions for schools innovating or failing to meet performance goals. The following descriptive study looks at the Kentucky Education Reform Act through the lens of the Center's parent involvement typology.

Type 1. Basic Obligations of Families

The Kentucky Education Reform Act of 1990 establishes Family Resource Centers and Youth Services Centers in those schools where at least 20% of the students are at-risk. The Family Resource Centers are located in or near elementary schools, while the Youth Services Centers are primarily in secondary schools. Approximately 70% of Kentucky's schools are eligible for funding for Family Resource Centers. The primary purpose of the Centers is to coordinate existing community and public services in one convenient location.

The Family Resource Centers provide families with preschool services, child care, family education programs with parents and children participating together, and health services or referrals. The Youth Services Centers provide social service referrals, job counseling, training and placement, coordination of summer/part-time employment, drug/alcohol abuse counseling, and family crisis and mental health counseling.

Type 2. Basic Obligations of Schools

School districts are required to provide preschool programs for four-year olds at-risk of educational failure. Parents must be informed of the program and be involved in learning activities in the classroom as volunteers. Parents are also entitled to family education programs and conferences with the teacher.

Schools are required to provide parents with information about their children's progress. This can take the form of parent-teacher conferences and traditional report cards. Other types of assessment tools suggested for use are portfolios and other qualitative reporting methods based on skills and knowledge (rather than letter grades). These alternative assessment tools inform parents about the substantive progress made by their children. The state of Kentucky has created a state department of assessment, which is examining various methods for assessing children's learning.

Type 3. Involvement at School

In the first four years of school (K-3), schools will institute an ungraded primary school program. This program stipulates that parents are to be included as

partners in their children's education by working with teachers to establish learning goals. Parents are encouraged to become a part of the school in a positive role, as opposed to receiving messages from the school only in the event of problems.

Type 4. Involvement in Learning Activities at Home

The primary school program encourages teachers to work with parents to create a positive learning environment both in school and at home. This type of partnership could include the development of learning activities which parents could readily use with their children at home.

The preschool program entitles every participating family to at least two home visits every year which is an opportunity to introduce parents to home learning activities. Home visitors can provide parents with materials and activities to use with their children in order to foster learning at home. This kind of training can set the foundation for future home learning activities for parents.

Type 5. Involvement in Governance, Decision-making, and Advocacy

One of the more familiar aspects of the Kentucky Education Reform Act is the establishment of school-based decision-making councils. Each council is comprised of two parents, three teachers, and the principal. Parents are elected by parent members of the local parent-teacher organization.

The councils are empowered to make school policy about personnel, curriculum, instructional materials, staff scheduling, use of space, discipline, and extracurricular programs. The councils make decisions about how many people can work in the school based on budget allocations and also select personnel in the event of vacancies. If there is a teaching vacancy, the council advises the principal, who makes the final decision. If the principal is leaving, the council selects the new principal from a list of candidates supplied by the superintendent.

The council is given at least $75 per pupil to spend on instructional materials. In those districts where more money is spent per pupil, the school council is entitled to that amount. No school, however, may receive more funds than others in the same district unless the district deems students in particular schools to have greater needs.

School councils have been established in order to create a learning environment consistent with the goals set by the school board. The council is required to remain within district guidelines unless an agreement is reached between the school and the board.

In addition to the school councils, parents are invited to participate on advisory committees at the building level, at the district level, and at the state level. At the building and district level, committees are established by school councils or school boards on specific topics of concern or as specified by law (for example, Chapter 1).

Another participatory decision-making mechanism is the Family Resource Center's local advisory council, which consists of parents, students, school staff, and community members representative of the community served by the centers. The advisory councils are responsible for developing plans, implementing them, and maintaining the centers. In addition to the local advisory councils, there is an Interagency Task Force for Family Resource and Youth Services Centers which is responsible for developing a five-year plan to establish the centers and review grant applications. Once a center is established in every eligible site, the task force will be abolished.

At the state level, there are two advisory boards that include families and community members: the State Advisory Committee for Educational Improvement and the Commonwealth School Improvement Advisory Committee. The State Advisory Committee for Educational Improvement is in charge of reviewing local district educational improvement plans and reports to the State Department of Education on the progress made by districts to achieve performance goals. The committee also identifies those schools and districts which are in trouble and requires the state board to take action.

The State Advisory Committee for Educational Improvement recommends to the state Department of Education the initiation of sanctions against schools and districts failing to meet performance goals. Sanctions against schools occur at three levels. The first sanctions are imposed when schools do not meet the threshold level of improvement but do not go below their baseline after their first round of testing. These schools are required to develop an improvement plan, and are also eligible to apply for state school improvement funds. If, at the second round of testing, these schools still are below their baseline but by less than five percent, they are assigned consultants to help them (in addition to developing a school improvement plan). If the next round of testing reveals that they have fallen below five percent, the schools are placed on probation and parents are allowed to move their children to another school in the home district (or neighboring district if necessary). The home district is required to pay for transportation costs.

Communities are also invited to participate on the Commonwealth School Improvement Advisory Committee. This committee is comprised of teachers, administrators, and community representatives, and is in charge of reviewing grant proposals for Commonwealth School Improvement Funds. These funds are to be

used to encourage schools to develop innovative instructional approaches and problem-solving skills.

Type 6. Collaboration and Exchanges with the Community

Through the Family Resource and Youth Services Centers, the Kentucky Education Reform Act encourages schools to coordinate services with community agencies and organizations. In addition, community-based organizations have taken initiative to work with schools in order to build a strong community presence in the schools. For example, the Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence has begun to establish Community Committees for Education in 22 school districts with 37 more to follow. The goal is to establish a Community Committee in each of the 176 school districts. The purpose of the committee is to disseminate information about the new reform law, train potential council members on their new responsibilities, develop communication between the broader community and schools, organize parents and communities to become active participants in schools, and serve as a resource to parents, community members, and schools on school reform.

Federal and State Efforts to Provide Comprehensive Services For Migrant and Homeless Children and Families

This section examines Federal and state efforts to provide comprehensive and continuous services to migrant and homeless children and families. Throughout the year, at least two million children migrate with their families from district to district and state to state in search of seasonal employment or adequate housing.[1] The frequent moves disrupt children's care and education and can lead to high levels of school failure.

The multiple needs of migrant children and families point to the necessity of a comprehensive service delivery system and suggest inter-agency collaboration and family empowerment as key strategies. Recurrent family mobility challenges agencies to reach out and collaborate beyond traditional service boundaries. Residency status can be an important influence on children's access to quality education and care. Collaboration can help schools and community agencies to serve children who are temporary residents of a community more effectively. For example, a public school and a homeless shelter in Worcester, Massachusetts are working together to provide alternative education to runaway youths. Department of Education program coordinators in Texas and Michigan are collaborating to help prevent migrant children from falling behind in school.

Although it is often assumed that families who are struggling with issues of poverty cannot be counted on to be a guiding resource for their children, highly mobile families can provide consistent support for their children's learning. When little else in a child's life is stable, families can be one of the few *constant* supports. The challenge is to provide highly mobile and all families with a range of opportunities which enables them to fulfill this role.[2]

The Importance of Comprehensive Services

There is growing national consensus that all children benefit from continuous and comprehensive educational, health and social supports (Levy and Shepardson, 1992). Continuity in care and education is a critical component of comprehensive services for children. Recent studies have shown that homeless and migrant children are at risk of health problems such as nutritional difficulties, psychological problems and school failure. Compounding the health and educational risks (which are shared

---

[1] A conservative estimate based upon 1990 data provided separately by the Federal Office of Homeless Children and Youth and the Federal Migrant Education Program.

[2] This discussion defines mobile families as families which are required to make frequent moves due to economic hardship and/or lack of adequate housing.

by most children in poverty) is the absence of stability due to families' economic hardships and frequent moves.

The access of migrant and homeless children and families to comprehensive services can be obstructed by a number of factors. Their lack of legal residency can deny or delay services provided by schools and health care organizations. Frequent relocation may place them far from familiar and needed services. As constant newcomers to communities, they are prey to stigmatization on the part of agencies or school staff. These and other obstacles can place both preventive and emergency services out of reach.

A comprehensive response to children's multiple needs would be aided by collaboration between the institutions which educate and provide care to children. Collaboration needs to occur between families, communities and schools and across Federal, state and district agencies which provide direction and support for local efforts.

Federal Educational Policy toward Migrant and Homeless Children

The Federal government provides services to migrant and homeless children under separate categorical programs. The three key Federal programs serving only migrant children are the Migrant Education Program, Migrant Head Start, and Migrant Even Start. The cornerstone of Federal policy for homeless children is the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Program, Title VII, Subtitle B. The intention of the Migrant Education Program and the McKinney Program is to support mobile children's academic success at school. While the provision of comprehensive services to support children's learning is an integral part of the Migrant Education Program, its emphasis within Federal educational policy on homeless children and families is more recent.

The Migrant Education Program (MEP), established by legislation in 1966, is a comprehensive service program for migrant children and their families. MEP is structured to enable collaboration across states and at the local level. States may make direct grants to school districts or community-based agencies to provide instructional, medical and social services. Additional funds are provided to extend services to children and families residing in a state through the summer months. The program also requires inter-state and intra-state coordination of activities. All states are required to provide information on migrant students to the Federally-funded Migrant Student Record Transfer System, a national telecommunications system which stores and transfers academic, health, and other records. The program also requires collaboration between agencies serving migrant children within a state.

Changes in Federal educational policy for homeless children and families are enabling a more comprehensive approach to service delivery. Amendments to the McKinney Act in 1990 authorized states to make grants to local education agencies for direct services for homeless children and related activities. However, only 30-50 percent of McKinney funds may be used to provide all support services. States are required to ensure participation of homeless children in before- and after-school care programs and school food programs. The amendments give local education agencies responsibility for coordinating inter-agency support for homeless children while offering few guidelines for intra-state coordination. Partly in response to lack of structure, state coordinators recently formed their own organization -- the National Association for the Education of Homeless Children and Youth -- to facilitate collaboration across states. At the Federal level, there has been preliminary action to coordinate Federal policies and programs to support comprehensive services for homeless children.

In spite of the increases in the numbers of migrant and homeless children and continued documentation of their needs, 1993 appropriations for both the Migrant Education Program and the McKinney Program were smaller than 1992 appropriations. Fortunately, changes in Federal policies which serve children defined broadly as educationally at risk are creating the possibility for additional Federal support for comprehensive services.

Expanding Program Eligibility

Categorization of eligibility requirements can inadvertently exclude children most in need of services. Up until 1992, a homeless child might have been denied services under the Chapter 1 program due to the lack of a fixed night-time residence. To address this, the Chapter 1 and Even Start programs have eliminated residency requirements for children identified as homeless by the local school district. Under new regulations, homeless children must be served regardless of whether they reside in a school attendance area which receives Chapter 1 funds.

While the change in policy is directed at homeless children, it has significance for migrant children as well. Traditionally, Chapter 1, Head Start and Even Start services have been provided to migrant children through categorical programs such as Migrant Head Start. However, tightening of eligibility requirements within migrant programs is likely to limit services for children who do not qualify as migrant but whose lifestyles are still complicated by mobility and poverty. Consequently, local administrators will need to look increasingly to non-migrant programs such as Chapter 1 to provide mobile children with comprehensive services.

Increased Community Access to Funds

Community agencies can provide supplementary services to homeless and migrant children where and when they need them. For example, the maximum stay in a transitional housing program for runaway girls in Boston is 45 days. Close to sixty percent of the girls do not attend school on a regular basis, making it an impractical site for school programs. Community-based programs which have more sustained contact with mobile children and/or their families can now apply for funding under Even Start, Chapter 1 and the McKinney program. The Even Start program is unique in requiring schools and community agencies to collaborate in the planning and implementation of comprehensive service programs funded under the grant. Consequently, the program can create a critical bridge between agencies serving mobile children at different times of the day or year.

Programs serving migrant children have long recognized the community agencies as important partners in supporting children's academic development. Nevertheless, changes in Federal legislation such as Chapter 1 and Even Start have opened the door for increased collaboration across agencies who provide services to children who may or may not have been identified as migrant.

Some Federal programs have loosened program eligibility requirements and increased community access to funds. The following section describes how some states are using inter-agency collaboration to provide more comprehensive services for migrant and homeless children. The initiatives described involve collaboration between agencies across district and state lines -- the traditional geographic boundaries which have defined institutional responsibility to children and families. Taken together, they illustrate an approach to inter-agency collaboration which is driven by families' needs rather than bureaucratic tradition or convenience.

Inter-State Collaboration: Texas-Michigan Migrant Education Program

Economic necessity can force both migrant families and homeless families to make frequent moves from state to state in search of seasonal employment or housing. A recent survey revealed that close to 75 percent of adults residing in Minneapolis temporary housing had lived in Minnesota for less than two years, having recently migrated from another state (Wilder Research Center, 1992).

Frequent inter-state moves also are common for migrant families. For example, 80 percent of the children served annually by Michigan's Migrant Education Program are from Texas. It is estimated that close to three thousand middle and high school students leave Texas in May and travel with their families to work in Michigan's agricultural and fishing industries. Their perennial migration can disrupt their

education, frequently leading them to fall behind and in many instances drop out of school. Michigan farm labor camps frequently are located many miles from the school, making regular attendance at school difficult.

The states of Michigan and Texas are working together to eliminate unnecessary disruptions in migrant students' education. Both states are participating in the Portable Assisted Study Sequence Program (PASS), established through the Migrant Education Program, which is a national home-based curriculum for middle and high school students to master course work and earn needed credits towards graduation. The alternative program enables migrant students to continue their school work outside of the regular school environment.

In addition, the two states are working to coordinate educational standards and assessment. Michigan's extended day and after-school programs are being revised to complement Texas' new standards of Academic Skill, which emphasize critical thinking skills. In 1991-92, Texas officials came to Michigan to administer the state graduation test to migrant students who missed the June administration. In addition, Michigan hosted Texas teachers during the summer months to serve as mentors and advisors to Michigan teachers.

Intra-State Collaboration:Florida Migrant Education Program

The shifting availability of shelter and/or seasonal employment opportunities can pressure homeless and migrant families to make frequent moves within a state. Florida is the home-base for over 57,000 migrant families, many of whom migrate throughout the state to work in the agricultural and fishing industries. The state has attempted to respond to the intra-state mobility of its migrant population through a state-wide system which includes the following components:

- Credit Accrual System: Florida has devised a state-wide credit accrual system to help ensure that credits earned by students in one district toward graduation apply to all districts throughout the state;

- Summer Institute: At-risk migrant students are recruited to participate in "Summer Institutes" located on college campuses throughout the state. Students participating in the program can earn credits toward graduation. In addition, they receive a $450 stipend and weekly spending allowance which is close to what they might have earned in as seasonal worker;

- Advocacy Network: The state has developed a migrant family information packet which includes contact lists of health, educational and social services available in agricultural and fishing regions of the state. In addition, the state employs a migrant advocacy worker in each "migrant area" who visits migrant families in their own homes to help connect them with available community resources.

Inter-District Collaboration: Minneapolis-Chicago Record Transfer System

In 1991, Minnesota initiated a comprehensive record transfer system between Chicago and Minneapolis. A needs assessment revealed that significant percentages of homeless families residing in Minneapolis area shelters had recently migrated from Chicago, Illinois; Gary, Indiana, and Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Up to three-month delays in the transfer of student records meant that homeless children were not receiving critical support services, particularly in special education. The state has crafted a simple solution to the problem which has helped eliminate delays and improved services for children. Critical information can now be obtained from the sending school district by fax. Community shelters which serve large numbers of homeless children also can be hooked up to the fax. This enables homeless advocates to identify a child's needs and connect them with social services in the transitional period before they find permanent housing.

Intra-District Collaboration: Minnesota Co-Location of Services Project

In 1992, the Minnesota Department of Education made a total of 30 grants of up to $50,000 each for projects aimed at improving the links between social service programs and students in districts throughout the state. Rather than singling out a specific population of children, the program make services available to children challenged by a wide range of factors including homelessness, economic distress, and educational failure. Funded through a combination of funds from Drug Free Schools and Communities, the Minnesota Chemical Abuse Prevention Program, and Governor's Discretionary Funds, the program is an example of how collaboration across Federal and state agencies can help support local collaboration. Each project involves a consortium between educational, health and social service agencies serving a particular district. For example, the Minneapolis Youth Diversion Project involves the Minneapolis Public Schools, the Minneapolis Federation of Alternative Schools, the YMCA, the Minneapolis Employment and Training Program, and Project Solo, a youth service organization. A Steering Committee of seven key school agencies coordinates services, training events, and co-location of services.

Acting on the principle that individuals rather than institutions are community builders, the program has established a peer advocate system. Youth outreach workers are counseled to train and advise other youth on getting the support services that they need.

Obstacles to Collaboration

Although Federal and state policymakers are taking steps to coordinate services for migrant and homeless families, lack of collaboration between Federal programs and state programs can prevent children from getting critical educational services. For example, it is estimated that close to half of all eligible migrant children do not receive special education services. Federal law requires the development of an Individualized Education Plan (IEP) for each child. However, the fact that many migrant and homeless children stay in school for less than two months at a time leaves educators with little time to develop the requisite plan. In many instances, children move on to their next home before the plan has been developed, or services are delayed as the new school waits for records to be transferred.

Lack of collaboration between Federal and state programs can keep comprehensive services out of children and families' reach. By law, residency status cannot be used to exclude children from participation in before- or after-school programs. However, given that homeless children's temporary residences frequently are located outside of the school's regular bus route, local program administrators may need to provide a separate form of transportation. However, only 30 to 50 percent of Federal McKinney Funds can be used to pay for *all* support services. State McKinney Offices have argued that Federal law has created a requirement without giving states the resources and flexibility to implement it effectively.

The Importance of Family Involvement

Collaboration between and across agencies at the Federal, state and local level can help programs serve migrant and homeless children more effectively, but collaboration between institutions is not enough. All families, including those which are highly mobile, need to be the key partners in collaborative efforts to improve outcomes for their children. One migrant parent explains that for children who are mobile, "parents provide the continuity, the connecting link. Classroom teachers will not pick up overnight and move along to the next harvesting field to provide instruction. The one constant is the parent." The same may be true for children of the homeless. Families of the homeless can provide continuous support for their children's learning as families make moves between shelters and between schools.

For the most part, Federal programs targeting migrant and homeless children have taken a somewhat narrow approach to family involvement. Family involvement requirements under the Migrant Education Program mirror those of the basic Chapter 1 program. Generally, state and local agencies are required to consult with participating parents in the design and implementation of the program and to craft policies and programs and procedures which support family involvement. The formation of a parent advisory council at the state and local level is the only specific programmatic

requirement. Significantly, Migrant Education Program funds may be used for activities to support family empowerment activities, such as adult education classes.

The McKinney program for homeless children does not require the formation of parent advisory councils at the state and local level. The McKinney program requires that decisions regarding the educational placement of homeless children be made in the best interests of the child -- and that parents' requests be considered as part of this decision. States have the option of limiting parent involvement in decisions concerning educational placement. As of 1989, only Massachusetts, New York and Virginia gave parents control over decisions concerning their children's educational placement.

Involvement in school-based or school-oriented decision-making are just two ways in which families of mobile children can support their children's learning. Families' mobility can serve both as an obstacle and *resource* for family involvement. For example, while it might prove difficult for a currently migratory parent to be a regular and active participant in a school council meetings, the same parent might help her own or other migrant children with their homework on weekends. Alternately, while the search for housing may prevent homeless parents from regular participation in school-based activities, even limited involvement of some parents in program planning can help the school become more responsive to homeless children's needs.

The following section examines state and local efforts to empower migrant and homeless families as key partners in their children's development. The needs of mobile children and families require expanding traditional concepts of family-school-community collaboration to reflect the fact that for many, home is a shelter, and what constitutes a community changes with the seasons. Unlike most collaborative efforts, the programs described below target the family (rather than the school or agency) as the critical link between the child and comprehensive education and care.

Local Efforts to Support Comprehensive Family Involvement

Type 1: Basic Obligations of Families

Due to constant moves, migrant and homeless families can be isolated from services which help them support their children's academic development -- for example, information about nutrition, child care and academic readiness. The challenge is to develop programs which provide services to families where and when they need them. The McAllen Parental Involvement Program in McAllen, Texas is a comprehensive parent involvement program, serving families who migrate annually from Mexico in search of seasonal work. The program is supported through a combination of school district, Federal Chapter 1, and Chapter 2 funds. Evening Study Centers, open two nights a week at three elementary schools in the district, offer

classes in English as a Second Language, parenting education, and parent support groups.

Type 2. Basic Obligations of Schools

Traditional school-home communication strategies have relied heavily on written communication to reach families. However, when families lack permanent residences at which they can receive mail, new forms of communication are needed. The Minneapolis Public Schools employs two full-time staff to serve as school-home liaison for homeless children and families temporarily housed in the Minneapolis 4-10 Shelter. Initially funded through state and McKinney monies, the School-Shelter Outreach Project is a response to the dramatic increase in children moving through the shelter and their documented obstacles to enrollment and success in local public schools. The outreach workers meet every new family which comes to the shelter, consult with a parent with regards to the child's placement in a regular or alternative public school, make arrangements for transportation (e.g., a school-to-shelter van) and follow-up on the child's school attendance once a family leaves the shelter.

Type 3: Involvement at School

Minnesota is drawing upon the mobility of families as a resource for improving services and education for homeless children. The Minnesota Parent Back Pack (adapted from the Arkansas Parent Back Pack) contains a child's academic and health records and travels with the family as they move between school districts. This is an alternative to inter-institutional transfer of records, which can sometimes be delayed by bureaucratic red tape. In many instances, a homeless child may be denied critical supportive services, such as special education services, while a school waits to receive records from the child's school of origin.

Type 4: Involvement of Families in Learning Activities at Home

Highly mobile families with young children cannot count on easy accessibility to traditional supports such as the extended family or familiar community agencies, which others take for granted. Some local programs are tapping family-to-family support networks to encourage migrant and homeless parents' involvement in learning activities at home. The Marion, Oregon Migrant Even Start Program is a home-based district-wide early childhood parent education program which serves Spanish and Russian speaking families who serve as temporary agricultural workers in the region. The preschool groups meets twice weekly in the homes of participating parents. Families rotate the responsibility for hosting the preschool groups.

Type 5: Involvement in Decision-Making, Governance and Advocacy

Michigan is working to insure that mobility of migrant families does not preclude participation of these families on the state parent advisory council. Migrant Education Program parents can elect a proxy parent to fill in for a parent who is absent for a period of time due to seasonal employment obligations. Likewise, parents interested in serving on a parent advisory council at the local level can arrange to serve on the council during harvesting months when they plan to be in the area.

Type 6: Collaboration and Exchanges with Community Organizations

Under funding provided by the New York State Attendance Improvement Drop-out Prevention Programs and the New York City Board of Education, the Students Living in Temporary Housing Program provides alternative instructional services for students at 61 shelters throughout New York City. Family assistants, based at the shelter, are responsible for ensuring that homeless families are apprised of their rights and options regarding educational placement.

Conclusion

The mobility of families challenges Federal, state, and local agencies to collaborate across traditional service boundaries and create policies and programs which respond to children's needs wherever they reside. Selected Federal, state and local policymakers are taking steps to respond to children and families' mobility by coordinating services across state and district lines. However, lack of collaboration between Federal programs and at the state level can prevent collaboration from having real benefits for children and families.

Mobile families can help create continuity in their children's education where inter-agency collaboration continues to fall short. Selected states and districts are tapping the resources mobile families bring and supporting them in new ways. However, programs for migrant and homeless children which take a comprehensive approach to family involvement remain few and far between. This lack of parental involvement in programs serving mobile children is significant given the fact that parents, rather than institutions, remain responsible for making sure that children get to school, that their records arrive, and that they receive the social services which support learning.

Conclusion

Our review of policy activity in four areas -- services integration, transition from early childhood programs to school, parent involvement in decision-making, and programs for migrant and homeless children -- illustrates the flawed nature of the Federal-state-local policy system for education and human services discussed in many other reports.[3] We cite specific examples of the barriers that make it so difficult to construct programs that serve the needs of children more comprehensively. The main point of this report is to identify many examples of promising efforts at all levels to use collaboration as a strategy to overcome these barriers.

In this final section, we draw some broad conclusions, discuss how our good examples have implications for changes in policy and practice at all levels, and sketch our plans for the next steps in our efforts.

Most Federal and state policy activity continues to be highly categorical, targeted at specific populations, and bound by specific funding ear-marks and limits. A highly compartmentalized, fragmented policy system continues to be a major obstacle to making services and programs for children and families more comprehensive across broader categories of need, topics, and participants. Fragmentation continues to be the reality between local, state, and Federal levels and among the branches and executive units within each level.

Naturally, the fragmentation of services at the level of service delivery and for the intended beneficiaries is the result of the nature of the policy system. Multiple agencies serve the same clients with similar or overlapping services or fail to serve children or families at all because they do not fall within the correct "birthday window" or income requirement. Local schools and service-providing units often find themselves implementing multiple and sometimes conflicting local, state, Federal, and privately-funded initiatives, with results that are not good. Below we discuss several initiatives in which policymakers are seeking more comprehensive approaches. However, we have found very few examples of collaboration at the level of joint worker-family efforts to "determine needs, set goals, and work toward greater family autonomy and functioning" (Table 2) -- a level of collaboration which in this report we call "family empowerment."

The scarcity of illustrations of family-level collaboration is a reflection of the strong traditions of top-down planning and decision-making in education and the human services fields from Federal to state; from state to city or town; from city or

---

[3] See, for example, Solving the maze of federal programs for children and families. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

town to individual school or agency; from the school or agency to front-line worker; from professional to parent or client, from front-line worker to the end-user.

If progress toward comprehensive services across areas of need, ages, and categories of participants is the goal of policymakers and administrators -- and we believe it should be -- then collaboration, including family empowerment, offers considerable promise as a strategy. But our cases make it clear that changes in policies and practices at all levels are needed to encourage the wider use of this strategy.

What We Have Learned

As we look across our four cases, we see that much can be learned from the several examples of policies and programs that aim at making services more comprehensive and at encouraging strategies of collaboration and family empowerment. In some cases, these lessons can be applied to plans for systemic change; in other cases, they suggest smaller scale modifications.

1. *Federal programs are not often well coordinated with state initiatives, but they can be.* Federal policies to encourage comprehensiveness can produce positive results at the state and local level.

The cases are sprinkled with examples of Federal by-passing of the states, lack of coordinated Federal-state planning, and mandates that are ambiguous, duplicative of other efforts, underfunded, and inflexibly constricted by narrow categorical definitions.

We note a few good examples of Federal efforts to address these flaws through collaboration. Good examples are Even Start, the Head Start/Public School Transition Demonstration Project, and the Head Start State Collaboration Project.

Even Start requires grantees to collaborate with local community agencies in planning and conducting comprehensive service delivery programs. Unlike most Federal programs, Even Start bridges traditional agency boundaries in targeting both preschool and school-age children. Even Start at least implicitly recognizes all four levels of Bruner's framework (Table 1, page 3).

The Head Start demonstrations encourage collaboration at the inter-agency and intra-agency and worker-family levels and try to provide continuity in parent involvement in decision-making and other areas from early childhood into the public schools.

Chapter 1 planners could follow the California example and encourage inclusion of comprehensive family-community-school partnerships by incorporating

our Center's six-part typology (Table 2, page 6) -- or another similar typology-- as a useful planning tool. They could also spread the Chapter 1 net more widely from early childhood through adolescence and stress school-wide approaches.

2. *State-level policies are not often well coordinated with local practices, but they can be.* State actions for collaboration (including family empowerment) have a positive effect on local practices.

The cases describe several examples of state initiatives that are underfunded, ambiguous, contradictory in their guidance to local administrators, or riddled with gaps and funding restrictions. They also offer illustrations of state actions engendering local responses which have created promising programs of collaboration and family empowerment.

Florida is a good example of a state whose initiative encourages collaboration from the state level to the building level. Florida sought to encourage service integration by creating three inter-agency level coordinating mechanisms and promulgating state-wide principles stressing individual empowerment as a key to self-sufficiency and the creation of selected local councils to give a voice to families themselves.

3. *Funding for local programs is usually from a single, restricted source, but multi-source funding is possible.* Combining state and Federal funding and flexible local planning can facilitate the creation of more comprehensive programs.

The cases show that single-source funding from Federal and state sources with complex restrictions and set-asides still characterizes the policy system and is a barrier to comprehensive programming. The examples point to possibilities for multi-source funding that make comprehensiveness and collaboration more possible. Even Start's regulations encourage multiple funding.

The New Jersey GoodStarts Program draws upon a combination of Federal Child Care and New Jersey Department of Education funds to provide comprehensive services to preschoolers ages 3-4 and their families. Creative multi-source funding at the state level helps create incentives rather than roadblocks to collaboration between social service agencies and school systems.

One local example of imaginative use of available resources, despite their fragmented nature and restricted funding sources, is Las Cruces, New Mexico, where they draw on an impressive array of Federal, state, district and private funds to support a far-reaching comprehensive service delivery network with home-school-community collaboration at its hub. Head Start, Chapter 1, Migrant and Bilingual Education, Follow Through, and Adult Education funds are being matched with state

and district funds and private money to provide comprehensive services to close to 500 children from birth through school age.

4. *Consumer demand can be a spur to policies for more comprehensive services and collaboration.* Demand from families being served can result in increased opportunities for collaboration and family empowerment.

The cases provide only a few examples of increased family demand for changes toward more comprehensive service. A Pennsylvania Head Start Transition project has hired a parent coordinator who will organize an advocacy group of families of Head Start graduates. In other cases, local projects with advisory boards which include grassroots parents may have the potential to be channels for family demands for changes in service policies and practices. Children Now, an advocacy group in California, has developed an "Annual Community Score Card," which in the hands of community organizations can be a tool to encourage policymakers to revise their policies and programs.

Dade and Broward Counties' Rainmakers have drafted a consumer bill of rights and encourage family involvement in decision-making. At the state level, a private advocacy organization, the Florida Family Resource Coalition, is seeking to organize a network of service providers and advocates and to influence state policymakers.

5. *Private foundation policies can encourage comprehensive programs.* Our policy review did not focus on private sector policies. However, our scanning of current periodicals and staff participation in several conferences make it clear that many private foundations have a strong interest in many of the topics covered in this report. These include: Annie B. Casey, Danforth, DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest, Ford, Kellogg, Lilly, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur, Charles Stewart Mott, RJR-Nabisco, the Pew Charitable Trusts, and Rockefeller.

As an example of an effort to develop and test new comprehensive programming approaches, Pew has launched in a small number of states a major new services integration program: The Children's Initiative: Making Systems Work. This initiative requires the participating states to "commit to making significant investment in services to children and families and to developing the intergovernmental and public-private government capacity to provide long-term leadership for the project" (Pew Charitable Trusts, 1992).

Clearly, private funding sources can encourage comprehensive local planning and the use of funds from multiple Federal and state sources. They can encourage collaboration and family empowerment. Private sources can fill niches that are hard to

cover adequately with many government programs, such as research and evaluation, staff training, or the use of telecommunications.

We have noted evidence of collaboration between and among foundations (including local community trusts) and between private fund sources, public planners, and private organizations and universities sponsoring projects. This kind of collaboration can be useful in advancing state and local efforts to move toward more comprehensive services for children and their families.

Fitting Policy to Family Needs

Our analysis across cases suggests some elements of policy design which support strategies of collaboration and family empowerment in local programs. These elements are by no means exhaustive but point to concrete steps which policymakers can consider in developing and evaluating their policies.

The Family as Agenda-Setter and Partner in Collaboration

One source of information about student and family needs and strengths that is often overlooked by state level policymakers is the family. To be truly collaborative requires including the family as a partner rather than as an object of collaboration. Minnesota, Arkansas and New York have taken important steps in this direction by crafting policy which acknowledges parents of homeless and migrant children as a potential link, rather than the obstacle between the child and comprehensive services. Likewise, policies should support continuous family participation as children move from one school level to the next.

As agenda-setters and partners in collaboration, families can play many different roles including: (1) assessors of family/community needs and strengths; (2) designers and decision-makers of programs to meet these needs and capitalize on strengths; (3) implementors of programs; and (4) evaluators of program outcomes. In the Dade and Broward Counties example, parent facilitators assumed all of these positions in collaboration with school and social service personnel.

Broadly Representative Advisory and Policy Boards

Representatives of all or most of the agencies and families and communities affected in planning and implementation are included in project councils, boards, or task forces to foster a collaborative spirit. To involve families effectively on advisory and policy boards requires clear specification of purposes and functions and authority on budget, personnel, and program. In addition, decision-making boards require creative approaches to fit the policy of shared decision-making to diverse families

needs, such as proxies or surrogates for migrant and homeless families participating on these boards.

Multiple Access Points to Services

To provide comprehensive services to families with differing and overlapping needs requires multiple access points to services (such as community centers, schools, and churches). To offer these services, programs need flexibility in funding requirements to access multiple sources.

Providing multiple access points to services include many strategies, from co-location of services to referral networks. Good examples are Kentucky's Family Resource and Youth Service Centers and Minnesota's Co-location of Services Project.

Inter-agency and Cross-role Networks

Networks between agencies and across roles (parents, teachers, service providers, etc.) enables financially-strapped organizations to pool resources around common needs such as training, staff development, and technical assistance.

Sharing of information about programs and strategies helps agencies learn from each other about what works or what is less effective. This exchange can include training, preservice and inservice workshops, sharing of records through databases, and technical assistance. Good examples are Dade and Broward Counties, and inter-state coordination encouraged under the Migrant Education Program.

Opportunities for Training Parents to Assume Less Traditional Positions

Training of parents to assume less traditional positions (e.g. home visitors, facilitators, paraprofessionals) is a central element in some of the examples, including Dade and Broward Counties and New Jersey's GoodStarts Program.

Other Support for Involving Families

Special consideration of the needs of low-income and immigrant families, single-parents, and those who live in inaccessible places is one way to support collaboration at the worker-family level. One example is the New Jersey GoodStarts program, which includes provision of support services under local programs' standards of accountability.

Collaborative Evaluation Mechanisms

There is evidence in our studies of only limited attention and funding for studies and evaluations. Much of the emphasis in evaluation is on single programs or projects. There is a need for much more research and evaluation, including studies that look across levels and program lines. Examples of such an evaluative component are California Tomorrow's studies of seven school-based integrated service initiatives in California, and Dade and Broward Counties creation of a database open to all participating agencies to monitor the progress of families and how families are being served.

Final Comment and Next Steps in the Project

The good examples are impressive, but very uneven. The gaps, limits, and slowness of progress are also impressive. Some Federal agencies and programs have moved aggressively (e.g., Head Start) and others have not. Some states such as Kentucky, Florida, and New Jersey have accomplished much in the direction of more comprehensive services; others are barely getting started. We have noted some local policymakers and administrators who have done notable work; many others appear mired in a flawed system and unable or unwilling to move toward either increased collaboration or empowerment.

There are many openings for change created by a new Administration in Washington; the impending re-authorization of the main Federal elementary and secondary education legislation; proposed reform legislation in many areas including vocational education, Head Start, and school restructuring; proposed laws in many states, and increases in private sector interest in the topic. And, just as importantly, for the first time in many years, collaboration and family empowerment are being discussed as critical components of current policy initiatives.

If the opportunities for change are to be capitalized on, it is important to attempt to identify the barriers that many have retarded efforts to date to converting the general consensus about the need for comprehensive services and reducing fragmentation into more widespread and concrete changes in policies and practices. It is important to seize every opportunity for systemic policy reform as well as for more immediate adjustments in policy and practice.

It is also important to learn as much as possible from the examples of local administrators and front-line workers who have learned to function within the existing fragmented system to serve their clients better and to take advantage of openings that make greater collaboration and family empowerment possible.

This will be the main intent of the next step in this project. We want to learn more about the "nuts and bolts" of such local efforts to provide services on a more comprehensive basis using strategies of collaboration and empowerment. We plan to derive from this further study suggestions for policy changes, rooted in more data about local policies and practices.

We will take a closer look at promising local examples of family-school-community partnership, examples where strategies of collaboration and empowerment are given significant emphasis. We will look at examples of programs with a variety of geographic characteristics and programs where schools and school districts play a central role as well as those where the school role is supplementary rather than primary.

In a two-year effort we will seek to understand:

- How are these local programs making use of state and Federal program funds and private sector resources to reinforce family efforts to support the development of children and the adult members of the family? What impact if any are these programs having on changes in state and Federal policies?

- What are the characteristics of policies and actions by policymakers that contribute to the goal of comprehensiveness and to the successful deployment of strategies of collaboration and empowerment; what characteristics are inhibiting progress?

- What methods, approaches, styles, and timing are present in successful use of strategies of collaboration and empowerment? To what extent are these transportable? What are the barriers?

- What are the effects on these local efforts on family responsiveness and self-sufficiency, on children's behavior and learning, and on program cost-effectiveness?

- How can families themselves become movers and shapers of policies and programs designed for their benefit?

In looking at these questions we will gather data directly in the field and will also draw as much as possible on other Center studies that are looking at similar questions and issues.

In the foreword to this report, Bernice Weissbourd, a leading figure for many years in the family resource movement, points out that families are in crisis and education and service systems have not been adequately responsive. She writes:

> The promise of healthier families in a community depends in large measure on the willingness of service providers, educators, and

policymakers to collaborate with each other and with parents toward achieving a shared vision.

Her words foreshadow the themes of our future work: learning how to achieve comprehensive services through strategies of collaboration and empowerment, thus providing a basis for improved practice as well as for needed changes in the policy system.

APPENDIX:

ORGANIZATIONAL DATABASE

SERVICE INTEGRATION

Council of Governor's Policy Advisors
The Family Connection
Georgia Department of Human Resources
47 Trinity Avenue, South West
Room 522-H
Atlanta, Georgia 30334-5600
Contact: Janet Bittner

Denver Family Opportunity Program
Denver Family Resource Schools
Mathtech, Inc.
609-520-3850
Contact: William A. Morrill

Healthy Start
California Department of Education
Interagency Children and
Youth Services Division
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

Interdepartmental Cluster for Services
Ohio Department of Human Services
65 East State Street, 9th Floor
Colombus, OH 43215
614-466-9303
Contact: Richard Morgan

New Beginnings
San Diego City Schools
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, CA 92103
619-338-2945
Contact: Jeanne Jehl

School-Based Youth Services Program
New Jersey Department of Human Services
CN 700
Trenton, NJ 08625
Contact: Roberta Knowlton

School-Based Integrated Services
Florida International University
Institute for Children and Families At Risk
3000 Northwest 145th Street
Miami, FL 33181
305-940-5684
Contact: Katharine Briar

EFFORTS TO SUPPORT TRANSITION FROM PRESCHOOL TO KINDERGARTEN

Migrant Even Start
Marion Education Service District (ESD)
3400 Portland Road N.E.
Salem, Oregon 97303
503-588-5330
Contact: Ernestina Garcia

New Jersey GoodStarts
New Jersey Department of Education
Division of Educational Programs and Services
225 West State Street
CN 500
Trenton, NJ 08625-0500
609-984-3429
Contact: Tynette W. Hills

New Jersey Head Start Collaboration Project
New Jersey, Office of the Governor
State House CN 001
Trenton, NJ 08625-001
201-648-2820
Contact: Liz Coleman

Oregon Head Start Collaboration Project
State of Oregon Department of Education
Special Student Division
770 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, OR 97310
503-378-5585

Pennsylvania Head Start Collaboration Project
Pennsylvania DOE
33 Market Street, 7th floor
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333
717-787-8595
Contact: Sandra Joseph

Project Reach
New Visions for Newport County
Newport, RI 02840
19 Broadway
Newport, RI 02840
401-847-7821

South Carolina Health and Human Services Finance Commission
1801 Main Street P.O. Box 8206
Colombia SC 29202
803-253-6154
Contact: Larry Davis

Virginia Council on Child Day Care and Early Childhood Program,s
110 Bank Street Suite 1116
Richmond, VA 23219
804-371-8603
Contact: Michael McGrady

US Department of Health and Human Services
Head Start Bureau
330 C Street, SW
Washington, DC 20202
202-245-0572

Worcester Public Schools
20 Irving Street
Worcester, MA 01609
508-799-3206
Contact: Allan Chates

SUPPORTING COMPREHENSIVE PARENT INVOLVEMENT

Abt Associates, Inc.
Cambridge, MA
617-492-7100
Contact: Mary Ann Milsap

Even Start
Compensatory Education Programs
U.S. Department of Education
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Suite 2043
Washington, DC 20202-6132
202-401-1682
Contact: William Lubosco

Head Start Bureau
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Post Office Box 1182
Washington, DC 20013
202-205-0572

Prichard Committee for Academic Excellence
Post Office Box 1658
Lexington, KY 40592
Contact: Carolyn Snyder

Kentucky Integrated Delivery of Services
Department of Education
Capitol Plaza Tower
Frankfort, KY 40601
502-564-2117

Special Education
Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services
330 C Street, SW
Room 4617
Switzer Building
Washington, DC 20202
202-732-5846

MIGRANT AND HOMELESS CHILDREN

Arkansas Department of Education
4 State Capitol Mall
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-1071
501-682-4475
Contact: Paulette Mabry

Center for Law and Education
955 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139

Council for Aid to Education
51 Madison Avenue Suite 2200
New York, NY 10010
212-689-2400
Contact: Scott Miller

Department of Health and Human Services
Administration for Children, Youth and Families
Office of Community Services
L'Enfant Promenade SW
Washington, DC 20447
202-401-9354
Contact: Joseph Carroll

Federal Office of Migrant Education
US Department of Education
Washington, DC 20202-6134
202-401-0744
Contact: James English

Florida Education Department
Academic Assistance Bureau
Tallahassee, FL 32399
904-488-6688
Contact: Louis Marsh

Florida State Department of Education
Homeless Program
Knott Building (Collins 1-34)
Tallahassee, FL 32399
904-487-8538

McAllen Public Schools
2000 North Twenty-third Street
McAllen, TX 78501
512-686-0515
Contact: Dr. Norma Woolsey

Massachusetts State Department of Education
Education of Homeless Children and Youth
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169
617-770-7493
Contact: Leedia Macomber

Michigan Department of Education
School Program Services, Migrant Unit
P.O. Box 30008
Lansing, MI
517-373-4581
Contact: Julie Shepard

Migrant Even Start
Marion Education Service District (ESD)
3400 Portland Road N.E.
Salem, OR 97303
503-588-5330
Contact: Ernestina Garcia

Minnesota State Department of Education
996 Capitol Square Building
550 Cedar Street
St. Paul, MN 55101
612-296-3925
Contact: Tom Gray or Tim Reardon

National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty
918 F Street, N.W. #412
Washington, DC 20004
202-638-2535

References

Administration on Children, Youth, and Families. (1990). Augustus F. Hawkins Human Services Reauthorization Act of 1990. P.L. 102-501.

Association for the Care of Children's Health. (1991). *Guidelines and recommended practices for the Individualized Family Service Plan* [Second Edition] (M. J. McGonigel, R. K. Kaufmann, & B. H. Johnson, Ed.). Bethesda, MD: Association for the Care of Children's Health.

Bruner, C. (1991). *Thinking collaboratively: Ten questions and answers to help policy makers improve children's services*. Washington, DC: Education and Human Services Consortium.

Center on Choice in Education. (1991). Washington, DC: Center on Choice in Education.

Comer, J. P. (1980). *School power: Implications of an intervention process*. New York: Free Press.

Davies, D., Burch, P., & Johnson, V. (1991). *A portrait of schools reaching out: Report of a survey on practices and policies of family-school-community collaboration* [Report No. 1]. Baltimore, MD: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.

Duncle, M. (1993). Solving the maze of federal programs for children and families. Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

Epstein, J. L. (1982). *Student reactions to teacher practices of parent involvement* [Report P-21]. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Epstein, J. (1990). School and family connections: Theory, research, and implications for integrating sociologies of education and family, in D.C. Unger and M.B. Sussman, *Families in Community Settings: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. New York: Hawthorne Press.

Epstein, J. (1992). *School and family partnerships* [Report No. 6]. Baltimore, MD: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.

Exploring children's early care and learning experiences. (1992). *ETS Policy Notes*, *4*(2), 1,4-7,10. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Services, Inc.

Henderson, A. (1987). *The evidence continues to grow: Parent involvement improves student achievement*. Columbia, MD: National Committee for Citizens in Education.

Levy J. and Shepardson W. (1992). A look at current school-linked services. In *The future of children* (1). Los Altos, CA: Center for the Future of Children.

Love, J.M., et al. (1992). *Transitions to kindergarten in American schools: Final report in American schools* (D. Washington, Trans.). U. S. Department of Education.

Milsap, M. A., Turnbull, B., Moss, M., Brigham, N., Gramse, B., & Marks, E. (1992). *The Chapter 1 implementation study* [Interim Report]. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

National Commission on Children. (1991). *Beyond rhetoric: A new American agenda for children and families*. Washington, DC: National Commission on Children.

National Governors' Association. (1989). *Results in education: 1989*. Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

National Commission on Migrant Education. (1992). *Invisible children: A portrait of migrant education in the United States*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

New Jersey State Department of Education. (1992, January). *The New Jersey GoodStarts Program:Request for proposals*. Trenton, NJ: Ibid.

Osborne, D. & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wellesley.

Owen, G. and Heineman, J. (1992). *Homelessness in Minnesota: Homeless adults and their children* (pp. 31-63). St. Paul, MN: Wilder Research Center.

Palanki, A., Burch, P. with Davies, D. (1991). *Mapping the policy landscape: What state and Federal governments are doing to support family-school-community partnerships* [Report No. 7]. Baltimore, MD: Center on Families, Communities, Schools and Children's Learning.

Pew Charitable Trusts: The children's initiative (1992). Unpublished Manuscript.

Ramey, C., & Campbell, A. (1987). The Carolina Abecedarian Project: An educational experiment concerning human malleability, In J. Gallagher & C. Ramey (Eds.), *The malleability of children*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

The new Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (1991, 4 March). *Education Daily*.

U.S. Department of Education: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (1992). *Sticking together: Strengthening linkages and the transition between early childhood education and early elementary school*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Weikart, D.P. (1989, June). *Quality preschool programs: A long-term social investment*. Occasional Paper No. 5, Ford Foundation Project on Social Welfare and the American Future. New York: Ford Foundation.

Zigler, E.F. & Freedman, J. (1987). Head Start: A pioneer of family support. In D. Powell, S.L. Kagan, B. Weissbourd, E.F. Zigler (Eds.), *America's family support programs: Perspectives and prospects* (pp. 57-76). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.